The Dissertation Committee for Seon-Young Kim Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

The Negotiation of Sociocultural Identities of Elementary-School Teachers in South Korea through Their Teaching with Multicultural Background Students

Committee:

Keffrelyn D. Brown, Supervisor

Sherry L. Field, Co-Supervisor

Noah De Lissovoy

Luis Urrieta, Jr.

Diane L. Schallert

The Negotiation of Sociocultural Identities of Elementary-School Teachers in South Korea through Their Teaching with Multicultural Background Students

by

Seon-Young Kim, B.Ed.; M.Ed.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

December 2014

Dedication

For teachers, who (will) teach students with a vision for equity and justice in and through education.

Acknowledgements

This dissertation would not have been possible without the support of people around me. I am truly grateful to everyone who has led me to this end of my dissertation. To begin, I would like to acknowledge my committee members. Thank you to my supervisor, Keffrelyn D. Brown, whose kind guidance and keen insights at every stage of this study were crucial to its accomplishment. I was greatly encouraged by her mentorship and sharing time; how blessed I am to have her as my supervisor! Sherry L. Field, who has been in my heart since the first semester of my doctoral program, bolstered me to keep this long journey. The vivid memories of the precious conversations at her office will keep lightening my path. I appreciate that I have connected to Noah De Lissovoy whom I learned critical perspectives and caring heart from. He consistently challenged me to be a thoughtful person. Luis Urrieta Jr. broadened my view on identity and teaching. It was an amazing gift that I experienced deep impressions in his classes along with his warm encouragement which energized me for my study. I was impressed by Diane L. Schallert who shared her expertise and simultaneously demonstrated a deep sense of humility. She taught me invaluable lessons beyond just academic approaches to discourse.

This book of dissertation and my doctorate owed a debt to the office of education to which I has belonged. If the office did not allow me to have a break for the doctoral program, I could not have even started this study. I also want to acknowledge its support given to me during four years of my program.

First and foremost, I want to thank the four teachers for their participation to my study: Sae-Ra, Do-Jin, Seong, and Yoo-Jeong. I cannot even describe how much their plain narratives and unaffected practices contributed to this study. I highly acknowledge the

passion and effort they showed, and sincerely ask them to understand my intention to figure out ways to help the four teachers and teachers beyond them be critical educators.

Of course, I cannot miss expressing thanks to my friends, colleagues, and mentors in The University of Texas at Austin, Austin in Texas, Bay area in California, and all around the world including South Korea. They sustained, comforted, encouraged, and inspired me by incredible ways. I wish each of them could receive my thanks. I would like to especially thank my writing friends because their extraordinary help was very important to my degree fulfillment.

The support from my family cannot be overly stressed. My mother-in-law, Gab-Jo Bae, my father, Kwang-Soo Kim, and my mother Gum-Ja Shin, recognized and cheered me with abundant love and endless prayers. I also wish to thank my sister-in-law, sisters, brothers-in-law, brother, and nephews for their encouragement. My husband, Hoo, who made me enjoy this work was the very perfect bless for me. With his love and support, I was able to achieve my doctorate. My precious children, Bon and Sunny, should deserve my big thanks. Because I cannot find any other words for their sacrifices, let me express my appreciation with saying that *I love you and thank you for being my children*. Finally, I thank God for opening my eyes to where, what, and whom You care about.

The Negotiation of Sociocultural Identities of Elementary-School Teachers in South Korea through Their Teaching with Multicultural Background Students

Seon-Young Kim, Ph.D.
The University of Texas at Austin, 2014

Supervisor: Keffrelyn D. Brown
Co-Supervisor: Sherry L. Field

This ethnographic narrative study explored the agent negotiation process of teachers with regards to their sociocultural identities. This study drew from two theoretical frameworks: social practice theory of identity for analysis of its negotiation process and critical multiculturalism as a yardstick to discuss teachers' sociocultural identities and practices. More specifically, this research examined the sociocultural identities of teachers in South Korea in the context of rapid multicultural change in South Korean society. The following question guided this research inquiry: How do elementary-school teachers in South Korea negotiate their own sociocultural identities through their teaching with multicultural background students?

Participants included four elementary school teachers in South Korea during summer 2013: two homeroom South Korean female teachers, one single subject South Korean male teacher, and one bilingual Korean-Chinese female teacher. Data collected in

the study came from four (4) interviews, four-six (4-6) classroom observations, and document analysis.

This study analyzed the context of multiculturalism and larger societal discourses found in South Korea, each participant-teachers' sociocultural identities, and the process of teachers' negotiation of their identities accompanied by their teaching practices. The results offered three main findings about the attribution of sociocultural identity: (1) the influence of sociocultural factors and relations on teachers' sociocultural identities, (2) the teachers' role as an agent in the negotiation process and their possibilities to transform their identities by confirming new sociocultural understandings, (3) teaching practices as a tool reflecting as well as enhancing teachers' sociocultural identities. Based on the findings of dynamic interplay between social context and individual actions, several implications were drawn out in terms of appropriate conditions and methods for teachers' critical sociocultural identity (trans)formation, a new perspective on the meaning of teaching practice, transformation of educational contexts, and future research, which are necessary for critical multicultural education that pursues social justice and equity.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

In this chapter, I explain how certain aspects of my life experience motivated my interest in the topic of this dissertation. More specifically, I show how I came to focus on teachers and their sociocultural identities, as well as on critical multicultural education which underpins the study.

Becoming a Teacher

During my student days in South Korea, there seemed to be two contradictory views of teachers: on the one hand, they were seen as persons worthy of great respect, with prestigious and secure jobs; on the other, they were regarded with a mixture of fear and scorn, as perpetrators who oppress students and parents using the threat of high-stakes test. In some cases, if someone said you acted like a teacher, it was considered an insult. Nevertheless, when I was a senior in high school, at the insistence of my parents, I made a decision to enter a college of education. During my pre-service program, I was not at all interested in the courses and was looking for any job other than teaching.

However, when I was a junior in college, there was a critical moment: I met excellent in-service teachers who were truly committed to their work. They sacrificed themselves and their time to serve students. The more I got to know these 'good teachers,' the more I was impressed. I realized that the negative view of teachers in the society was—at least in this case—undeserved. Over the next year, I gradually decided to do what I could

to change these negative attitudes. I hoped to contribute to overpowering the atmosphere against teachers in school and society through presenting a case of "good teacher." When I began my work at an elementary school, I tried to be a "good teacher" like those I had met previously, who did not have their own self-interest in minds, but sincerely cared for students' growth and well-being. I began first with my own attitudes and practices. Then, working in teacher communities, I encouraged others to be sincerely committed to their profession and to develop a genuine rapport with their students.

Through these experiences, I decided that I wanted to help and support teachers to become "good teachers". I viewed this work as "my calling" and came to see myself as a teacher of teachers. To learn more about teachers and their professional development, I finished my master's program in South Korea, and later came to the United States for doctoral study. Because of this commitment to my calling, I kept my research focus on the aforementioned issues across the courses I took and the readings I had within them. I always tried to relate the content to my interest in teacher education.

In A New World

As I pursued doctoral studies in the US, living in a foreign country forced me to re-shape my sense of self from new and radically different perspectives. My status as a member of a social, cultural, and economic minority resulted in a new understanding of myself as a cultural being. I had to engage with unfamiliar experiences in the new world I had entered: attending graduate classes and sending my children to institutions where we were not members of the dominant group; dealing with financial uncertainties as a student family; living without any other family members nearby except for my immediate, four-person family; and navigating daily life without familiarity with the society of the US.

Additionally, the solicitude and occasional overt hostility from some dominant people significantly affected me and gave me the opportunity to reflect on who I was and the social context in which I lived. Rather than being used to or blaming the current situations, I was able to focus critical reflection on myself. Then, I came to consider how foreigners in my home country experienced life there; I also remembered how I had treated people who were culturally different from myself.

Further, my exposure to critical theories in my doctoral program was helpful in comprehending—at a macro level—the sociocultural dynamics that affect my own life. I finally found myself in sociocultural trajectory. I became aware of the extent to which I have been at an advantage as a South Korean in my home country, and, at the same time, how South Korean society systematically marginalizes non-South Koreans. I had the many privileges and benefits due to institutionalized social and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986) while blinded about any produced inequities. In terms of class, I came to understand how much socioeconomic status determines people's lives in the capitalistic system of South Korea, especially when it intersects with other factors, such as race, gender, language, etc. I also expanded my earlier views on language. Instead of thinking that speaking another language is merely a personal merit, I noticed how much the inability to speak and write in the dominant language threatens a person's being and life.

These new understandings led me to seek to work actively for the rights of minority people in South Korea and to find ways to support them. I often imagine my future as one in which I constantly question and seek to eliminate privileges derived solely from my sociocultural backgrounds and to work with and for social equity and peace, especially for alienated people. It is this imagination that reshapes and reinforces the critical understandings that I have come to hold for my sociocultural self.

New Research Directions

When I critically understood myself from a sociocultural perspective, the issues of diversity and social equity began to take a primary role in my research interests. My transformed sociocultural identity caused me—for the first time—to reflect on what the notion of "good teachers" might mean in the face of multicultural changes. Drawing from my personal experiences as a minority student and as a mother of minority students in the US, my focus was directed towards helping teachers to become critical educators rather than only effective teachers for majority students. Whenever I had difficulties as a student or as a mother, I used these problems to gain insights into how teachers might become more capable of meeting the needs of students from diverse backgrounds and of contributing social justice. As noted above, my exposure to the critical multicultural literature (e.g., Castro, 2010; Howard & Aleman, 2008; Kumashiro, 2000; Sleeter, 2008; Villegas & Davis, 2008) increased my interest in this approach. This scholarly work showed that teachers can make a difference in students' learning as well as they can have an effect on social equity and justice. Thus, my definition of good teachers was broadened to include "good teachers for diverse students and for social justice and equity."

Interestingly, much of the literature on critical multicultural education addressed how teachers' sociocultural understanding of themselves exerts a powerful influence on their classroom practices (Banks 2009; Grant, 2012; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; Nieto, 2003; Nieto, 2005; Sleeter & Grant, 2003). Teachers' awareness of and reflection on their sociocultural identities serve as a first step in the process of becoming a critical pedagogue. Thence, my attention and curiosity lied on teachers' sociocultural understanding.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

> *How can the teachers' selfhood become a legitimate topic in education and in our public dialogues on educational reform? ... If identity and integrity are found at the intersection of the forces that converge in our lives, revisiting some of the convergences that called us toward teaching may allow us to reclaim the selfhood from which good teaching comes. (Palmer, 1998, p. 3; p. 21)*

Given the culturally, socially diverse settings of schools, critical multicultural education focuses on acknowledging diversity and pursuing social justice and equity (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; May, 2009; May & Sleeter, 2010; McLaren, 2000). Critical multicultural education actively affirms diversity and differences in sociocultural relations from the perspectives of various groups and challenges unequal and institutionalized power relationships such as racism, class, capitalism, religion, and sexism (McLaren & Torres, 1999; McLaren, 2000; May, 2009). In order to fulfill critical multicultural education, many scholars have attended to teachers and their important role because the ways teachers approach and practice critical multicultural education make a difference in students' learning and educational experience (Banks, 2001; Grant & Sleeter, 2007; Nieto, 2009).

Scholars have outlined many key elements that are necessary to become an effective critical multicultural educator. These include possessing certain knowledge, skills, attitudes, and dispositions about teaching and students: cultural and linguistic knowledge, subjugated curricula knowledge, curricular and pedagogical knowledge, critical understanding of social structures, sensitivity to the political nature of schooling, the ability to do research about students' backgrounds, emotional coping skills, and countering beliefs against deficit thinking, cultural superiority, color blindness, and meritocracy (Banks et al., 2005; Castro, 2010; Cochran-Smith, 2010; Ferguson, 2002; Gay, 2000; Grant & Sleeter, 2007; Howard, 1999; Kumashiro, 2000; Milner IV, 2010; Moll et al, 1992; Nieto, 2000; Pollock et al, 2010; Sleeter, 2008; Villegas & Davis, 2008; Zeichner,

1996). In addition, researchers have proposed several pedagogical approaches for teachers in order to facilitate culturally diverse students' learning and their commitment towards social justice in/through education. These include the liberatory pedagogical approach (King, 1991), critical pedagogy (Freire, 1983; Kumashiro, 2000), humanizing pedagogy (Bartolome, 1994), culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995), culturally responsive pedagogy (Gay, 2000; Howard & Aleman, 2008), culturally sensitive pedagogy (Gonzalez, 2005), and decolonizing pedagogy (Tejeda et al., 2003).

These pedagogies are much more complex than superficial and technical skill sets (Cochran-Smith, 2010). They entail teachers' subjective perspectives and judgments, i.e., interpreting, posing questions, making decisions, and forming relationships, which are "deeply personal matters inexorably linked to their identity and life stor[ies]" (Carter & Doyle, 1996, p 120). In other words, effective instruction from a critical multicultural perspective is inseparable from teachers' sociocultural identities (Glazier, 2005; McVee, 2004; Tisdell, 2006). How teachers teach is mediated through their understandings of who they are historically, racially, and culturally in relation to social reality (Dixson & Dingus, 2008; Glazier, 2005; Nieto, 2003). When teachers critically situate themselves in relation to the problems of institutionalized inequities and injustice, their way of teaching is more likely to address and ameliorate these problems (Cochran-Smith et al, 2008; Scot & Pinto, 2001; Sleeter, 2008). For example, if a teacher understands his/her sociocultural identities in relation to others and how he/she is marginalized or privileged due to their positions, he/she can consciously and thoughtfully consider how his/her everyday teaching practice might counteract inequality and inequitable practices (Pollock, 2008).

Given the significance of teachers' sociocultural identity, exploring how teachers (re)construct sociocultural identities merits scholarly attention (Castro, 2010; Kumashiro, 2000; Sleeter, 2008; Villegas & Davis, 2008). Before developing discussion over the

critical knowledge and skills, sociocultural identity itself deserves academic attention. Thus, the present research attempted to explore if and how teachers fashion their sociocultural identities and the attributes of these figured identities. Hence, this study investigated the following question:

1. How do elementary-school teachers in South Korea negotiate their own sociocultural identities through their teaching with multicultural background students?

With regards to teachers' sociocultural identities, researchers have increased their attention on the topic; yet, the extant literature still calls for more research (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2011). A main strand of research analyzes the one-way influence of sociocultural identity: how sociocultural identities significantly influence their teaching practice. Most of this work explored sociocultural identities of teachers of color (Ajayi, 2011; Dixon & Dingus, 2008; Shkedi & Nisan, 2006; Walker, 2001). However, there have been very few observations of (re)construction of sociocultural identity in routine, everyday teaching contexts (Ballenger, 1998; Howard, 1999; Milner IV, 2010).

Hence, this study examined the dialogic process of sociocultural identity (re)formation in relation to teaching practice. From a sociocultural constructionist perspective, sociocultural identities neither result only from the influence of circumstances, nor only by teachers themselves. Instead, sociocultural identities are social products negotiated between the self and the context. Thus, teachers orchestrate their own sociocultural identities through interaction within the educational setting in which they work (Holland et al., 1998). At this point, the behaviors or approaches of teachers' teaching practice can be the means to be engaged in the process of the negotiation (Bartlett, 2007). Therefore, this research studied how teachers negotiated their sociocultural identities

through their teaching practice with multicultural background students. Exploration of this phenomenon was aimed to yield new insights and further enrich current research on teachers' sociocultural identities.

More specifically, the present research aimed to study how teachers in South Korea negotiated their sociocultural identities. Due to South Korean historical backgrounds, most teachers in South Korea have not been exposed to multicultural educational settings (Na, 2011, J-M. Lee, 2008). Due to their cultural isolation, these teachers may have constructed limited sociocultural understandings of themselves (J-B Lee, 2012). However, since the 1990s, there have been increasing multicultural populations in South Korea. Accordingly, a large number of children from multicultural families are attending public schools and multicultural education has recently emerged (Korean Ministry of Education, 2012a). Since 2006, multicultural education in South Korea is vigorously practiced with its own particular characteristics and frames of meaning. As teachers participate in this educational world in which they face diverse students, unfamiliar cultural issues, and new cultural discourses, they come to fashion their own sociocultural identities (Holland et al., 1998). Thus, this particular account of formation of their own sociocultural identities of teachers in South Korea was studied. In addition, because most multicultural students in South Korea are in elementary school (Korean Ministry of Education, 2012a), elementary-school teachers in South Korea were the focus subject of this study.

Therefore, I examined how elementary-school teachers in South Korea negotiate their sociocultural identities in multicultural educational settings. I analyzed if and how teachers in South Korea (re)form their sociocultural identities and how the teaching practice in the world of multicultural education, in where they participate in as teachers, influenced their sociocultural identities. My research question was examined using an ethnographic narrative methodology, based on the perspective of sociocultural

constructionism and critical inquiry. I collected data from four elementary-school teachers in multicultural settings of South Korea. Based on these teachers' narratives, the study recounts the process of each teacher's negotiation of his/her sociocultural identity and the feature of their sociocultural identities.

CLARIFYING KEY CONCEPTS

In this section, I define the following key concepts in order to provide preliminary understanding of their meanings and premises adopted in this study: *critical multicultural education, sociocultural identity, multicultural background students, and teaching practice*. These terms will be more fully discussed in Chapter Two.

Critical Multicultural Education

Critical multicultural education is a transformative movement that places diversity and social justice at the heart. This critical multicultural education is rooted in critical multiculturalism which challenges institutionalized unequal power relationships in relation to racism or other forms of injustice (May & Sleeter, 2010). Thus, critical multicultural education empowers all students from different backgrounds and provides them with an opportunity to learn and to be critically engaged with different cultures, histories, and social contexts. In this study, critical multicultural education is discussed as a yardstick to critically examine South Korean teachers' sociocultural identities and their classroom practices, as well as the current status of South Korea's multicultural education.

Sociocultural Identity

I explored South Korean teachers' sociocultural identities through application of concepts proposed by Holland, Lachicotte Jr., Skinner, and Cain (1998). Their understanding of the term is different from the narrower notion that these identities are inscribed in class, gender, and race. Instead, these scholars view sociocultural identity as dynamic social products resulting from a continual dialogue between the inner self and the outside cultural environment. In other words, these identities can be defined as a person's actions that happen as they cast themselves "in, through, and around the cultural forms" (Holland et al., 1998, p. 8).

Throughout this study, I use the term "sociocultural identity" to indicate my intention to explore individuals' negotiated understandings of themselves. The definition of self-understanding can be further elaborated as the sense of cultural self in relation to historical, cultural and social realities. Beyond the categories of ethnicity, gender, race, or class, sociocultural identity implies much more complex understanding of one's historically, socially constructed nature (Giroux, 2000). Thus, this identity entails awareness of a culturalized, socialized self in regards to a stratified society (Scot & Pinto, 2001). As implied above, teachers' sociocultural identities can be conceived of as understandings of how and why they have been privileged or marginalized in the sociocultural systems. In turn, this also encompasses an understanding of social relation and others.

Multicultural Background Students

In South Korea, the scope of multicultural education has been limited to two groups of students (Korean Ministry of Education, 2012a): children from binational marriage families (i.e., one parent is South Korean and another is a foreigner), and children from

migrant worker families (both parents are foreigners) (J-M. Lee, 2008). Thus, the society mostly refers to a multicultural student as the child from one of these two categories. Given this reality, the entire discussion in this study most often targeted the children of two groups. However, this study identifies "multicultural background students" as students from diverse backgrounds that include gender, social class, ethnicity, race, nationality, culture, sexual preference, abilities and disabilities, native language, and religion (Gillborn & Youdell, 2009).

Teaching Practice

I use the term "teaching practice" to indicate all the actions and reactions of teachers related to what happens in their classrooms. "Teaching practice" refers not only to how instruction is delivered in classroom settings, but also to teachers' emotions, behaviors, and activities that teachers show as a position of teacher. In this study, besides mediated actions by sociocultural identities, I also regard teaching practice as a cultural resource itself that manages teachers' other actions, further that influences teachers' sociocultural identities. The resource is means or tools by which people use to engage in the contexts and develop their sociocultural understandings. Yet, at the same time, I acknowledge that the teachers' personal teaching practice is also limited by a range of the existing collective practice in the world of multicultural education.

SIGNIFICANCE

It is hoped that the findings of this study will contribute to educational research and practices of teacher education in regards to teachers' critical sociocultural identities and multicultural teacher education in the following ways:

First, this study may help teacher educators to consider how teacher education might better support the critical transformation of teachers' sociocultural identities. The process of identity negotiation reported here provides an account of the triggers or hindrances teachers face in regards to their own critical sociocultural understanding. In addition, the teachers' stories demonstrate how teachers' understanding about themselves and their social relations informs their classroom practices (Holland et al., 1998). The present research emphasizes the importance of the teachers' sociocultural identities that potentially play in effectively teaching multicultural students. Thus, teacher educators and policymakers may learn the importance of their attention to teachers' sociocultural identities; further, they should be able to support the critical transformation of teachers' sociocultural identity or to provide appropriate space for their agency.

Second, the results challenge widely-held beliefs about teachers' professional development. So far, professional development has tended to promote integrated, consistent, and static goals in a linear manner (Hawley & Valli, 2008; Richardson & Placier, 2001). Teachers are forced to reach an idealized standard of competence as effective experts (Bransford et al, 2005; Prawat & Floden, 1994; Zumwalt & Craig, 2008). However, my analysis of their negotiation process highlights the subjectivity of teachers themselves, who are conscious, criticize, approve, suggest, and plan their practices (Tytler et al, 2011), and their agency. It argues that the cultivation of "a teaching self," aware of one's sociocultural identities, should be the primary aim of teacher education (Rodgers & Scott, 2008, p 733).

Lastly, this study yields a deeper understanding of South Korean multicultural education. A recent development, multicultural education in South Korea is playing out in a unique historical and social context. As yet, there has been little research done to describe this phenomenon via the collection of thick qualitative data (A-M Jo, 2009; J-M. Lee,

2008). Moreover, there has been no research on teachers in South Korea from the perspective of a sociocultural identity. Therefore, this study suggests new ways of preparing teachers to fulfill critical multicultural education in South Korea. Furthermore, the detailed accounts of multicultural education likely draws researchers' attention to classroom practices and appropriate support. Much of the theoretical work in critical multicultural education is conceptually dense, but has not been effectively communicated to classroom practitioners (Sleeter, 2012). Therefore, another important implication is promoting practical application of multicultural education.

Chapter 2

Context, Theoretical Framework, and Literature Review

THE MULTICULTURAL CONTEXT OF SOUTH KOREA

One of the most dramatic changes in contemporary South Korean society is the increasing number of multicultural families. As children from these multicultural families have entered school, diversity has become an issue. Since 2006, multicultural education has emerged as a controversial topic, and several policies have been implemented to address the needs of the changing context. This section introduces the nature of this changing population and the state of multicultural education in South Korea. Additionally, current multicultural education for in-service teachers in South Korea as well as their cultural backgrounds are discussed. Yet, the following discussion roughly examines the current context of South Korea at a macro level at an introductory level; readers may find the more detailed, focused description and discussion in Chapter Four.

Increasing Diversity and Current Situation

Until very recently, South Koreans have believed that the country is racially homogenous, and the principle of bloodline has defined the notion of Korean nationhood and citizenship (S-M Jeong, 2010; UNESCO UN CERD, 2007). The idea of a single race has been prevalent in Korean society since the Japanese colonial period (1919-1945). This belief has been credited with preserving national identity throughout historical periods: independence from Japanese colonial rule, the Korean War, and dictatorial governments (J-B Lee, 2012; S-W Park, 2008; D-H Hu, 2010). Education and media have been key in

reinforcing this ideology (Y-C. Kim, 2011). For instance, the content in national textbooks, which are taught cover to cover in the schools, have maintained this ideology. Until very recently, official textbooks contained these sentences: "our nation consists of one race of one bloodline" (2nd grade, Moral), "we are one race who looks the same, has one culture, speaks one Korean" (6th grade, Social Studies), and "our nation proudly keeps a tradition of homogenous ethnicity which is rarely found in world history" (10th grade, Nation) (Han & Han, 2007, p 87). Thus, South Koreans have been indoctrinated with pride for their homogenous ethnicity (D-H Hu, 2010). Even if South Koreans recognize their kinship with other Asians as Mongolians, the notion of "pure" Korean blood has established their racial identity as unique (United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, 2007).

Yet, the bloodline doctrine has been challenged since the 1990s as South Korean society has experienced demographic changes. A large number of foreigners have come to South Korea through binational marriages (i.e., one spouse is a foreigner) or as part of the work force. The size of the foreign population was 267,630 in 2001, and has increased to 982,461 in September, 2011 (The National Statistical Office, 2013). Most foreign workers have poorly paid jobs, such as construction workers, and many are undocumented and, thus, risk being deported (S-B Oh, 2009). More than 90% of the multicultural families in South Korea are associated with binational marriage. In 89.2% of these binational families, the mother is non-Korean. The mothers are from China (57.3%), Vietnam (19.8%), the Philippines (5.7%), Japan (5.1%), etc. (The National Statistical Office, 2013). Most mothers in these families come to South Korea lacking both language skills and cultural knowledge (S-B Oh, 2009; H-S Yoon, 2004). 52.9% of these foreign-mother families live

below or near the poverty line (The Ministry of Education, 2008), and 38.7% of them reside in rural areas (The Ministry of Education, 2012a).

The number of children from these families has also rapidly increased: there were 44,258 multicultural children in 2007 and 151,154 by 2011 (The Ministry of Security and Public Administration, 2011). In the schools, there were 9,389 students from multicultural families in 2006; in 2012, this number had grown to 55,780. 90.96% of them are children from binational marriage families (The Ministry of Education, 2013a). The table 1 shows the changing ratio of multicultural students to entire student population in South Korea.

Year	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Percentage	0.26	0.35	0.44	0.55	0.70	0.86
Numbers	20,180	26,015	31,788	38,678	46,954	55,780

Table 1: Changing ratio of multicultural students to entire student population in South Korea.

It is expected that this rapid growth of multicultural students will continue, and that they will account for more than 1% of entire student population by 2014 (The Ministry of Education, 2012b). Because most multicultural families are recent arrivals since the late 90s, only 38.1% of these children have entered school (The Ministry of Security and Public Administration, 2011). Thus, when these children get older and go to elementary school, their numbers will increase dramatically. This population is also increasing in middle and high schools. In 2013, 70.8% were in elementary school, 20.2% were in middle school and 9.0% were in high school (The Ministry of Education, 2013a). There will, obviously, be

more pressure on middle and secondary schools to provide multicultural education as these students move on to higher levels (S-B Oh, 2009).

There are also other groups of multicultural students such as Korean returning from abroad and children of North Korean refugees. From the mid-1990s until 2009, 17,984 refugees had entered into South Korea. 40% of them came as a family unit. According to official records, there were 2,296 North Korean adolescents in 2008 (J-H Choi, 2011). The second group is South Koreans who return after residing in overseas countries for two years or more. In 1994, there were only 4,074 members of this group, but in 2010, there were 19,985 returnees (Moon & Lim, 2012). The Ministry of Education defines multicultural students as those from families consisting of people from racial, ethnic, and/or cultural backgrounds that differ from the majority. However, the Ministry of Education policies only take into account children from these two categories, binational and migrant worker families (J-M Lee, 2008; The Ministry of Education, 2006). Thus, when multicultural students are referred in South Korea, usually these two groups are meant as subjects of multicultural education.

Multicultural Education

In response to these demographic changes, the Ministry of Education has focused attention on multicultural education since 2006. In 2006, for the first time, the Ministry took a census of the population of students from these types of families and established a comprehensive policy on multicultural education entitled *Educational Support Plan for Children from Multicultural Families* (The Ministry of Education, 2006). Since that time, the Ministry kept publishing updates of multicultural education every year until 2012. Due

to the centralized educational system in South Korea, these plans have been quickly applied to schools nationwide through local offices of education.

In 2006, the Ministry of Education deleted references to 'homogenous ethnicity' from textbooks and announced that the national curriculum should foster tolerance and acceptance of students from all cultures. After-school programs for multicultural students were also implemented under this directive. In 2007, Central Multicultural Education Center was opened. The center has developed teaching materials and holds teacher training sessions. Each local office of education has also designated its own "Multicultural Education Center." The Ministry of Education has provided financial support to multicultural education projects proposed by the local offices. It has also operated policy-research schools since 2007. Under the 2008 plan, the Ministry held multicultural conferences and gave awards to schools that performed the best in this area. In 2009, the plan outlined helpful strategies for parents of multicultural students: publishing a brochure about schooling in foreign languages, holding conferences with translators, and providing parent education programs. In order to further support multicultural understanding, the plan also required in-service training as well as courses in colleges of education for pre-service teachers.

In the 2012 plan (The Ministry of Education, 2012a), there were six strategies proposed to improve multicultural students' learning:

- Support for transition into public school: specially trained coordinators as well as pre-school classes.
- Enhancement of Korean language and academic skills: KSL (Korean as a Second Language) as the official curriculum and one-on-one mentoring.

- Provision of a bilingual program for every student: learning opportunities for children from diverse cultures and languages at after-school programs, recruiting and training bilingual instructors.
- Practical career guidance: vocational schools with multicultural instruction.
- Creation of a multicultural school environment: 150 exemplary schools, recruiting of multicultural pre-service teachers, and multicultural teacher education.
- Enhancement of mutual understanding: revising textbooks, multicultural activities, and programs for parents.

These forceful measures at the governmental level have had immediate effects in schools with multicultural populations. Yet, in spite of these efforts, there are critics that these are actually existing in two mixed multiculturalism: conservative and liberal. For a very long time, ethnic nationalism has been the means to maintain national identity and a hierarchy of paternalism in South Korea (J-B Lee, 2012). Thus, in conformance with these values, multicultural education has conservatively focused on the assimilation of these students into dominant Korean culture or else has focused on their development as a human resource for South Korean society (J-B Lee, 2012; Watson, 2010). This conservative and utilitarian approach, however, is viewed by some as contradictory to public ideals of democracy and freedom (Watson, 2010). In contrast to the conservative view, liberal multicultural education promotes tolerance and acceptance of others from the point of view of cultural relativism (K-J Seol, 2012). For this reason, the Korean multicultural curriculum has been developed by taking into account cultural differences related to race, particularly as these differences become evident in (e.g.) dress, dance, and diet. Moreover, multicultural education also neglects cultural difference between each different background's

multicultural students. G-S Han (2007), S-B Oh (2010), and Y-C. Kim (2011) argued that Korean multicultural education deals with diverse populations of multicultural backgrounds by generally grouping students into a "multicultural" population category.

Multicultural Education for Teachers in South Korea

Multicultural teacher education in South Korea has been implemented under the 2009 plan of the Ministry of Education. In the plan, specific strategies were laid out in four sections. One of these sections laid out four specific plans for teacher education.

First, beginning in 2009, all colleges of education nationwide that certify elementary-school teachers were required to include a class on multicultural education. The course is usually designed for freshmen's general education (K-H Mo, 2009). Second, the plan mandated the publication of teacher manuals with practical advice and other background information for teachers of multicultural students. The manuals included, for example, the following skills and knowledge: how to do the necessary administrative work for transferring foreign students, how to counsel multicultural students, what subjects and topics these students find difficult, how to do career guidance, and how to educate the parents of multicultural students. Third, the plan required principals, vice-principals, school commissioners, and school vice-commissioners to take a multicultural education training course. Fourth, each local office of education was told to provide multicultural education training for in-service teachers. The local offices organized in-service training during the summer or winter vacation. Participating teachers are grouped by level: elementary school and middle and high school; usually, each training session has 30-80 teachers per group. The amount of time spent on this training varies from 15 to 65 hours.

Teachers in the 60-hour training take an exam at the end of the session and receive a score that counts toward promotion.

The information provided during the in-service training sessions can be classified into eight areas (K-H Mo, 2009; Mo et al, 2010; Hur et al, 2010): the present circumstances of multicultural students (i.e., what kinds of difficulties they have and how much they are at risk); theoretical background (i.e., the concept of multiculturalism and the goal of multicultural education); the multicultural curriculum (i.e., how teachers implement the multicultural curriculum within the existing curriculum); instructional skills or effective teaching strategies; counseling multicultural students and families; experiencing other countries' cultural artifacts such as songs, food, movies, etc.; the policies or legislation related to multicultural students; and visits to schools in multicultural settings. J-H Na (2011) and K-H Mo (2009) affirmed that these training sessions focus primarily on multicultural sensitivity, relationship skills, and information or superficial knowledge about multicultural students from a deficit perspective. Mo, Choi, and Lim (2010) pointed out that teachers might understand multicultural education as prioritizing culture and difference or as an issue affecting only individual students. This trend of teacher education is found in much of the extant South Korean-based research on teacher education. J-H Na (2011) analyzed 10 studies that proposed a multicultural education curriculum for teachers. Among these studies, published from 2008 to 2010, only one (J-H Jeong, 2009) proposed a curriculum based on *critical* multiculturalism.

Teachers' Sociocultural Backgrounds

In South Korea, there is little research on teachers' sociocultural backgrounds except for surveys of pre-service teachers. In 2002, Song and An (2003) conducted a survey

of the backgrounds of freshmen students who entered colleges of education located in Seoul. These students' fathers worked as government employees (24.1%), company staff (30.1%), and businessmen (18.8%). 53.2% of their fathers had completed college or graduate school. 86.5% of these students answered that their parents were willing to pay for their tuition and living expenses, and 55.2% of them said that they did not have concerns about being able to afford tuition. 58.3% of them said their families did not have any financial challenges. Only twenty percent answered that their families had financial difficulties. A survey from another college of education revealed very similar results, which were also related to the socioeconomic backgrounds of the pre-service teachers (Park & Lee, 1997). Thus, it seems that most pre-service teachers are from middle or upper-middle class families.

Moreover, these pre-service teachers can be assumed to be South Korean. There is no research that reveals the number of teachers who are of Korean nationality, but the absence of such research strongly suggests that their nationality has been taken for granted. No mention of non-Korean teachers has been found. However, there may soon be more racial diversity because applications to pre-service programs from non-Korean students have been encouraged since 2012. For 2013, twenty positions were specifically designated for multicultural students (The Ministry of Education, 2012a). In addition, since the system of bilingual teachers—employing migrant women of binational marriage— has been introduced, there are teachers from diverse racial backgrounds.

A large body of research has focused on teachers' perceptions of diversity. Most teachers who responded to surveys reacted positively to the presence of minority students (Han et al., 2010; Um & Won, 2012). Thy also agreed that multicultural education is necessary, and that it is a teachers' duty to develop an awareness of related issues (K-S.

Lee, 2011; Mo & Hwang, 2007). However, some teachers felt discomfort towards the changing demographics of South Korea. They agreed that they might accept foreigners as neighbors, but they were not yet willing to embrace foreigners as family members (Park et al., 2008). Some teachers responded that they were not uncomfortable with multicultural students, but that they would prefer to have students from the same cultural backgrounds (Mo & Hwang, 2007). In studies carried out by S-J Kwon (2010), Lee et al. (2010), and K-H. Lee (2011), it was found that many teachers had stereotypical notions about multicultural families. They assumed that these families were of lower socioeconomic status and that their children came from negative home environments. Many teachers also assumed that these multicultural students would do poorly in school. According to H-S Ha (2011)'s study, some teachers did not notice any difference between multicultural students and Korean students, but they had negative attitudes towards them due to their appearance or character. Yet, other teachers did have positive attitudes regarding their ability to learn.

With regard to the aforementioned contexts of recent multicultural change, it can be noted that most current in-service teachers, who finished their own schooling before the 90s, did not experience non-Korean student-friends and non-Korean teachers in their K-12 school. Moreover, teachers completing the credentialing programs before 2009 were not able to take any multicultural-related courses in their pre-service teacher education. Thus, having multicultural students in their classrooms might be the first time for most of them to directly confront multicultural people and issues. Some of these teachers might have attended in-service training, but it is still not taken by majority teachers yet. Before the governmental regulations, which were implemented beginning in 2009, there was no systematic in-service multicultural training. For instance, in 2010, only two teachers out of 68 had had previous in-service training of multicultural education (Mo et al, 2010).

According to Zhu (2011), less experienced teachers, however, have more training experience; 90.4% of teachers with less than five years of experience had had multicultural training experience. It may be because, usually, the newest teachers take the training when a school is asked to send only one person.

In sum, most teachers in South Korea are racially homogenous, born of South Korean parents, and they come from relatively secure family socioeconomic background. Even if they may have multicultural experiences in terms of personal travel or relatives, their direct and close contact with multicultural people seem to have been limited. Yet, at the same time, they show a negative understanding of multicultural students.

SOCIOCULTURAL IDENTITY

> *People tell others who they are, but even more important, they tell themselves and then try to act as though they are who they say they are. These self-understandings are what we refer to as identities. … These forms of self-understanding are always construed relative to a figured world of social life. "An alcoholic," "a father," and "a judge" are all particular answers to the question "who am I?" (Kuhn and McPartland 1954), where the implicit condition is "relative to such and such a social world (Holland et al, 1998, p 3; p 68).*

Sociocultural identity is defined in many different ways, but it is often understood as national and racial identity (Kim, 2007; Sussman, 2000), that is, one's perception about a shared common racial heritage with a particular racial group (Helms, 1990). Alternatively, sociocultural identity often refers to someone's identity related to religion, social class, gender, and language (Au & Blake, 2003; Ndura, 2004). Yet, there are other broader approaches to defining sociocultural identities. For instance, Casmir (1984) defines sociocultural identity as "the image of the self and the culture intertwined in the

individual's total conception of reality" (p 2). Similarly, sociocultural identity has been defined as an understanding of the historically, socially constructed self (Giroux, 2000), and as a recognition of the socialized, culturalized self in relation to a stratified society (Scot & Pinto, 2001). In other words, sociocultural identity is constructed based on a holistic transmitted system of cultural meanings and norms (Collier & Thomas, 1988). Simultaneously, individuals actively produce their sociocultural identities through a social process of engagement with social narratives and practices (Clarke, 2008).

In this vein, I specifically adopt the concept of Holland, Lachicotte., Skinner, and Cain (1998) as a framework for understanding sociocultural identity in this study. This social practice theory of identity is based on sociocultural constructionism drawn from the work of Mead, Vygotsky, and Bakhtin. Before discussing sociocultural identity in detail, I first discuss the distinct sociocultural constructionist approach to sociocultural identity.

Overview of Sociocultural Perspectives on Identity

Akkerman and Meijer (2011) and Gee (2000) reviewed perspectives on identity over three historical periods. In pre-modern times, identity was defined in a single form by the collective norms, rooted in traditional or religious authority; everyone took these positions for granted. Furthermore, these norms ensured the identity of their social worlds. In the modern world, people recognized their own identities, and identity seemed a part of their individuality as they differentiated the internal self from external others. Instead of accepting an identity determined by outside forces, individuals were regarded as choosing and forming their unique identities. In the postmodern age, both of these perspectives—the notion of a single truth and the central position of individuals—have been challenged. Rather, the social contexts in which people are situated and engaged get attention as a

crucial field of identity. Thus, emphasis has been given to social interdependence, discourse, participation, and multiplicity of contexts.

With these changing perspectives, other scholars (Holland et al, 1998; Mohanty, 1993; Moya, 2002) identified two dominant views on sociocultural identity. The first one is *essentialism*, or the culturalist approach, which highlights shared experiences in a cultural group. It conceives of a person as a bearer of common culture who is an embodiment of a cultural tenet and its impetus (Holland et al., 1998). Thus, identity is a stable and unchanging cultural logic based on the authentic experiences of its members. The second is *postmodernism*, or the constructivist approach, coined by Holland et al (1998), which rejects experience as a source of objective knowledge. It, rather, conceives experience as an unstable and unreliable thing; so from this perspective, identity, which is fabricated and constructed, is fictitious and unreal. This postmodernist approach views identity as determined by social locations or discourses rather than real experiences. Social positions are imposed upon the self, and social forces shape identity within particular situations.

However, Holland et al. argued these two views are neither sufficient nor comprehensive; instead, they presented a sociocultural process of identity construction. Although this approach appreciates both perspectives, it goes beyond a permanent one-way construction through only subject positions or cultural tenets, and tries to reconcile the tensions between them. Identity is neither simply shaped by constraints nor merely imposed like "a blank sheet to be written upon" (Clarke, 2008, p 25). Rather, identity formation occurs in the interplay between social controls and individual actions. Therefore, identity is the product of "interconnections between the intimate and public venues of social practice" (Holland et al, 1998, p 270).

> Persons develop through and around the cultural forms by which they are identified, and identify themselves. … A better metaphor is not suture, in which makes the person and the position seem to arrive preformed at the moment of suturing, positions but codevelopment - the linked development of people, cultural forms, and social in particular historical worlds (Holland et al, 1998, p 33).

G. H. Mead laid the groundwork for this notion of identity with his concept of *symbolic interactionism*. While he distinguished the subject "I" from the object "me," Mead (1913, 1934) proposed that a self is shaped by social interactions instead of by a one-way imposition. When the "me" is affected by social stimuli and conduct, the "I," the observer who is conscious of the "me", criticizes, approves, suggests, and plans. Thus, the self-system, which has linkages between "I" and "me," reveals the dynamic between self and society at the same time. In this respect, Rodgers and Scott (2008) differentiated between identity and self: *self* is the meaning maker, and *identity* is the meaning made.

Bakhtin, a Russian philosopher and linguist, also offered a clear understanding of this dynamic relation. He conceptualized *dialogism*, which shows social interactions of the self in social groups. Instead of a binary between "language" in the realm of the social and "speech" in the realm of the individual, he mapped the relation between signifier and signified. As a person exists in a particular situation, the person must be addressed and answer meanings of values and judgment. The speech is neither a free act of choice nor a passive reflection of the situation; rather, it is a give-and-take between the particular speaker and pre-existing restraints. Speakers' style or forms of expression are also chosen between the speaker and the context (Holquist, 2002). In this way, identity formation is understood as a mutual and simultaneous dialogue of meaning production.

Using the concept of cultural symbols, Russian theorist L. S. Vygotsky suggested how individuals actively internalize a collectively formed system through self-management, instead of a stimulus-response relation. According to his theory, people

actively construct or convert cultural signs, behavior, or objectifications into a heuristic device to manage their own actions. When people assign meaning to cultural symbols and place them in the environment—in other words, as cultural resources are enacted in a social context, identity is (re)formed. Yet, he acknowledged that mediating devices are also products of social history, and semiotic mediation happens in the course of social interaction with others who appropriate the devices (Holland et al, 1998; Holland & Lachicotte, 2007).

Sociocultural Identities in Figured Worlds

Sociocultural identity is self-meaning and understanding of self. This meaning construction happens in social contexts, or what Holland et al. (1998) called *figured worlds*. In the world of particular cultural situations, people engage in a socially, culturally limited range of acts; they participate in socially meaningful activity and work within existing roles and positions. Thus, these figured worlds provide a frame for interpreting human actions, which are influenced by figures' positions. Through continuous participation in the routine happenings or daily encounters of these worlds, people are formed by collective social relations and gain a sense of their position. Therefore, figured worlds are the "socially and culturally constructed realm[s] of interpretation in which particular characters and actors are recognized, significance is assigned to certain acts, and particular outcomes are valued over others" (Holland et al., 1998, p 52).

Interestingly, the four types of identity proposed by an American linguist and philosopher also illustrate a similar concept. Gee (2000) defined identity as "being recognized as a certain 'kind of person' in a given context" (p 99) and categorized it in four ways tied to the different contexts of sociocultural forces. First, *Nature-identities* stem from

one's natural state (e.g., twins, blond hair), but these N-identities gain their force in relation to institutions, discourses and dialogues, or affinity groups. *Institutional-identities* are imposed from a recognized position of authority. In other words, particular institutions authorize people to hold the rights and responsibilities of their position in society. Third, *Discursive-identities* derive from the discourse or dialogue of other people about an individual trait or one's individuality. Last, *Affinity-identities* are composed of sets of distinctive social practices and experiences that people "share to constitute an affinity group" (p 105). These A-identities are "a sort of lifestyle" (p 109) that people sustain through their participation in certain practices of affinity.

However, sociocultural identities are not simply inscribed by figured worlds; rather, the individuals themselves actively engage in the formation of their own sociocultural identity. People perform self-censoring in certain domains and represent themselves through continual reorganization or adjustment. When people face conflicts in a figured world or tensions between the past and the present, they create a different self in practice. To this end, people use cultural artifacts. *Cultural resources* are means by which people evoke and develop the figured worlds. These cultural artifacts refer to both material and conceptual aspects (Bartlett, 2007): tradition, historical structures, relations with parents or God, a sense of self, labels, memories, narratives, or whatever has meaning in the figured worlds (Bartlett, 2007; Dole & Csordas, 2003; Kidron, 2004). Artifacts, as social products, are tools to engage in a process of cultural construction. While people are identified by their positions within the social context, they simultaneously fashion their identities with artifacts. As people adopt cultural artifacts in a particular figured world and rehearse them, they come to control their actions. Like Vygotsky's semiotic mediation, people mediate their own behavior, cognition, and emotion through artifacts; they manage and organize

their actions with cultural resources. From this view, cultural resources are personalized and used in the voluntary control of behavior. Thus, this semiotic mediation by the cultural resources provides or organizes alternative perspectives and re-visions of selves and figured worlds.

Negotiating Sociocultural Identities

In this regard, Holland et al. (1998) adopted the term *space of authoring* from Bakhtin's notion. Even though various positional identities and meaning frames inhabit the figured worlds and constrain people, sociocultural identities are not sanctioned as certain forms of identities by institutions, discourse, and contexts. The social forces of figured worlds affect figures in the worlds, but do not thoroughly dictate these figures' practices. As discussed above, cultural artifacts perform the role of transitional objects for people to refigure their cultural worlds and to author new and transformed identities. Thus, artifacts offer a space for developing identity and a space of authoring; moreover, figures, as agents in the worlds, actively respond to the worlds and attempt to make sense of them. People "are always authoring the meaning of action" because they have the ability to envision and create their worlds (Holland et al, 1998, p 279).

Sociocultural identities formed by authoring and semiotic mediation represent the agency of people, who accept, contest, and negotiate their sociocultural identities. After all, figured worlds are the space of practice, which is evolving, transforming, and negotiating sociocultural identities. Gee (2000)'s types of identities also explain this agentic negotiation. Institutional-identities are dependent on how actively or passively the figurers meet the roles or duties assigned to their positions. According to whether a person authors the position as a calling or an imposition, one differently constructs one's I-identity.

The Discursive-identities are also fashioned by how actively one recruits and facilitates the responses of others. If one wants to get recognized in terms of a certain discursive identity, the person actively accepts it and seeks to sustain the identity through others' recognition. Thus, D-identities are negotiated depending on whether a person actively achieves and accomplishes the identities or passively views them as mere ascription. Similarly, Affinity-identities are achieved when people actively want to join a particular group. Even if a person is forced to engage in specific practices, it is hard to coerce him or her to practice to be a particular kind of person. Therefore, Gee (2000) stated that these identities can be achieved only through an "interpretive system" (p 107) that recognizes and negotiates identities.

Throughout this continual refashioning of their worlds and themselves, people negotiate and recreate distinctive identities. The altered subjectivities created in the space of authoring are one's *history-in-person*. Compared to *histories in institutions*, which refer to the actual and structural sequence of events that occurred as a collective past, history in person refers to each person's individual subjective experience as personal social history:

> One's history-in-person is the sediment from past experiences upon which one improvises, using the cultural resources available, in response to the subject positions afforded one in the present. The constraints are overpowering, yet not hermetically sealed (Holland et al, 1998, p 18).

However, history-in-person is neither only within the person nor only in the social categories. Authoring self happens "in social venues, not just in personal imagination" (Holland & Lave, 2001, p 12). History-in-person encompasses both aspects: that of the innermost and generative intimate self-making, and the social, cultural, and historically reflected being. Thus, history-in-person refers to historical subjectivities that are co-developed through active interaction with the context (Holland & Lachicotte, 2007;

Holland & Lave, 2001). In other words, it is social phenomena and phenomena of the person (Bartlett, 2007). In sum, people personalize and produce social forms and cultural resources, and arrange their practices as social products. This ongoing formation process is the orchestration of various voices from discourses, situations, positions, cultural artifacts, performances, and so on. Thus, dialogic identity, which happens in practice, is an orchestration of a person's culturally mediated social practices.

Yet, the unique co-construction that people make always involves power relations because figured worlds are composed of power structures, and each position is mediated by relations of power. Even if people organize their positions and practices in a figured world, the people also assume other positions in multiple figured worlds because no one inhabits only one figured world. Thus, a person who cannot escape a social power structure is privileged in some worlds but less favored in other worlds. Therefore, this juxtaposition of power explicitly or implicitly addresses the ways of orchestrating identity; and people negotiate their sociocultural identities through responding to the day-to-day activities undertaken in particular circumstances. Hence, sociocultural identity, one's understanding of a cultural self in relation to historical, cultural, and social contexts, accompanies understanding of power relations as well. Whether one recognizes them or not, the history-in-person of each person results from an understanding of power relations (Holland & Lave, 2001). Therefore, people are able to fully construct their sociocultural identities with a critical understating of themselves and social power systems—i.e., how they have been privileged and marginalized in the sociocultural systems, what and whom their practices have privileged, how social power relations have operated in the worlds, and how their practices have contributed to the power frames and systems of the worlds.

This dialogic concept of sociocultural identities in figured worlds (Holland et al., 1998) is applicable to this study. Teachers are figures who practice teaching in the multicultural educational setting. The contexts of schools and classrooms have rules or guidelines about multicultural education, and these meaning frames and power structures are sustained. At the same time, teachers bring their sociocultural identities, constructed through each history-in-person, to the classroom. Between two constellations, teachers orchestrate their sociocultural understanding of self and power through daily encounters in teaching practice. Thus, teacher subjects both participate in the educational world and produce cultural forms that mediate the educational world. At this time, these lived teaching practices constitute teachers' sociocultural identities. This negotiation process, which (re)identifies the sociocultural selves of teachers, is explored in this study.

Teachers' Sociocultural Identities and Multicultural Teaching Practice

Based on the discussion above, this section reviews the extant empirical studies on teachers' sociocultural identity and their teaching practice in a multicultural setting. Literature of both the U.S. and South Korea is discussed.

The US–Based Literature

Recently, American educational research has begun attending to teachers' sociocultural identities. There have been many studies that are related to pre-service teachers' sociocultural identities (Au & Blake, 2003; Lien, 1999; Martin & Van Gunten, 2002; Mueller & O'Connor, 2007; Pewewardy, 2002; Van Galen, 2010; Vavrus, 2009). However, compared to the attention to pre-service teachers, research about in-service

teachers' sociocultural identity has rarely been conducted (Cochran-Smith et al, 2004; Montecinos, 1995). Among the previous research on in-service teachers, it is difficult to find studies that explore the negotiation of teachers' sociocultural identities through their teaching practice. Thus, in this discussion, I also included other empirical studies that did not explicitly work with sociocultural identities, but are heavily related to teachers' cultural awareness and critical consciousness of themselves in the context of teaching. In addition, the research reviewed here is about the sociocultural identities of American teachers who are from similar contexts to most teachers in South Korea, teachers who come from mainstream backgrounds and teach students of color or students from different cultural backgrounds.

Ballenger (1998) narrated her expanded sociocultural identity while she taught Haitian children in an inner-city preschool for three years. As she focused on the children's values and assumptions, she came to respond to these cultural differences. As she reconsidered her beliefs about others, she came to honor them through her interactions with Haitian students and their families. The story of Howard (1999), a white teacher, also showed similar results. As a person who had never met a non-white person before, he fashioned his sociocultural identity through missionary work at a summer camp for inner-city high school students in the black community. Due to his students' distrust of him, their struggles, and their hopes, he became aware of his privilege and racial identity as a white man. Here, he developed a multicultural awareness and committed to working against racism and oppression. Mr. Hall, a white male teacher discussed in Milner IV (2010), also showed how his teaching practice changed his sociocultural identity. As he revealed his low socioeconomic background and used it, in his teaching, to relate to students of color, he overcame their resistance and built a strong relationship with them. Throughout the

period, he understood his and his students' racial, cultural backgrounds, so he was able to work with the students in a good relationship.

Aside from these three cases in natural teaching settings, there are some cases of teachers constructing their sociocultural identities through controlled teaching experiences. In The Philadelphia Writing Project (PhilWP) conducted by Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1992), urban school teachers of literacy participated in an exchange program involving schools that were different from one another in race and ethnicity. Teachers observed and even taught each other's students. During the process, these teachers confronted their own racism and recognized their role in sustaining racism. Further, they questioned their experiences of school practice that reproduced inequities and constrained students' opportunities. Thus, these teachers not only worked together to create more culturally responsive curricula and pedagogy, but also became committed to reforming school policies. Another study by Donaldson (1997) described how teachers implemented an antiracist curriculum in 1995. As teachers reviewed the curriculum handbooks, they were examining racist conditioning and internalized oppression in their schools. Further, as they practiced antiracist lessons, seven teachers developed a critical self-understanding and expanded understanding of racism. Thus, they increased their commitment to and confidence in addressing racism and encouraged other teachers to become interested in an antiracist curriculum as well.

Similarly, Zozakiewicz and Rodriguez (2007) led teachers to implement multicultural and gender-inclusive education in science, mathematics, and technology. As they taught the curriculum, they were moved to take a different look at themselves and their teaching practices. Teachers were able to affirm and raise awareness about multicultural differences, and further converted the project model for their school contexts.

However, three teachers in the study, who had more than ten years of teaching experiences, remained resistant to change. They thought they were already doing multicultural education or that multicultural education was just another temporary trend in education. A diverse range of teacher responses was also reported in the study by Proweller & Mitchener (2004). They studied 15 science-teacher interns in urban schools with low-income students of color. As the white interns suddenly cast themselves into the minority community, they raised critical questions about the meaning of their teaching and their own identities. Encountering urban youth of color developed the white interns' understanding of students' backgrounds and altered their visions of students beyond superficial impressions. Thus, some interns wrestled to create a space for a social justice issue. However, some also decided to teach in an apolitical manner, and some tried to practice benevolence by taking a superior position to the youth of color.

In sum, the extant literature offers several empirical studies implying that teachers' sociocultural identities are crafted in the teaching context. However, these do not provide a detailed account of this formation process, but only highlight how sociocultural identities affect teachers' teaching. Therefore, this study that provides a thick description of the features of sociocultural identity fashioning contributes to the existing body of literature.

South Korean Literature

I was not able to find any research exactly studying teachers' sociocultural identities in the South Korean literature. Regarding sociocultural identity, Korean journals have published on sociocultural identity of multicultural students (Bae, 2012; Bu & Kim, 2010; Jo, 2012; S-H. Kim, 2011), of their parents (Hyun, 2012; Park & Jeong, 2007), and of Koreans in other countries (Elvira, 2010; Kim & Kim, 2011). In addition, there are some

studies in relation to national identity (S-J Bae, 2013; Cho & Park, 2013; S-B Ha, 2012; Jeong & Lee, 2012; Y-K Lee, 2005; J-B Lee, 2012; D-H Seol 2007). In terms of teacher identity, their professional identities have been studied from the aspects of subject matter (Jeong & Nam, 2012; Lee et al., 2011; I-J Song, 2009), school level (O-S Yang, 2002), religion (S-J Oh, 2005), gender (S-M Han, 2003), and years of teaching experience (H-S Jeong, 2011; S-W Park, 2012).

Due to recent attention to the multicultural context in South Korea, educational research in the area of multicultural issues has increased since 2006-2007 (M-H. Kim, 2010; K-J Seol, 2012; Um & Won, 2012). The existing studies of multicultural education are about school curriculum (Bang, 2012; S-M Jeong, 2010; Lee & Kim, 2012), textbook analysis (K-J Seol, 2012), and multicultural students' experience (Lee et al., 2012; S-B Oh, 2009). Remarkably, another considerable portion of the literature studied teachers (J-H Na, 2011, Um & Won, 2012). There are studies about teacher education programs (S-A. Kim, 2011; T-S. Kim, 2010; W-S Jang, 2009; Mo et al., 2010; J-H Na, 2011; Seo & Lee, 2009) and teachers' perception of or efficacy toward multicultural education (Han et al., 2010; Jang & Jeong, 2012; S-J Kwon, 2010; K-S. Lee, 2011, Lee et al., 2013; Mo & Hwang, 2007; S. Park, 2011; Park et al., 2008; K-M Yang, 2010).

However, there is very little qualitative research that offers an in-depth examination of teachers' experience or perception related to multicultural education. H. Jo (2009) studied elementary school teachers' perceptions through participant observation and interviews. In the study, teachers expressed their dilemma between needing to treat multicultural students differently and the desire to maintain their current teaching methods. They also struggled between the pressure to be a fair teacher who treats each student equally and the pressure to respond to the students' differences. Similar results were found

in a study by Lee, Kim, and Hwang (2012). From data collected through interviews and observations, they revealed that teachers did not pay additional or special attention to multicultural students due to the value of egalitarianism. Teachers wanted to be fair to every student, and they only wanted to care for students who had specific problems. Thus, if the multicultural students did not belong to a low-achievement or low-income group, the students were excluded from the teachers' attention. Authors concluded that the teachers' indifference resulted from an institutionalized image of a good teacher as one who is "fair." In addition, although teachers cared about and wanted the multicultural students to feel competent at school, they did not attend to students' backgrounds. They did not even know the mothers' home country, but simply regarded them as from Southeast Asia.

Hwang, Ko, and Kim (2010) interviewed nine elementary school teachers who had taught multicultural students to analyze their experiences. They identified 1) teachers' challenges: students' academic, behavioral, and cultural issues; communication with parents; and lack of parents' involvement, 2) teaching methods: emphasizing learning Korean; treating students equally; and special care for the multicultural students, and 3) teachers' needs: operating special classes designated for multicultural education. Jang and Jeon (2013) studied two elementary school teachers through observations and interviews. The two teachers focused on the assimilation of multicultural students into the dominant Korean culture. Yet, throughout the year of teaching, as they had expanded experiences with the students, they changed their view on multicultural education. One teacher came to be concerned about one student's sociocultural identity and other students' consciousness of that identity. She also came to show her desire to practice multicultural education and to receive teacher training on multicultural education. Yet, as time passed, another teacher

became tired and lost her will to advocate for the multicultural student due to the student's frequent absences.

Interestingly, like the study reviewed above, many survey studies reported that teachers' perceptions and attitudes were influenced by their teaching experience in multicultural settings. Teachers who had taught multicultural students more deeply realized the necessity of multicultural education (Choi & Jeon, 2011; K-J Yoon, 2011). In a study by Lee et al. (2013), teachers showed a difference in their cognitive and behavioral attitude according to their teaching experience. Yet, a few studies showed a contradictory result. Lee and Song (2008) and Yoon and Kim (2008) reported that teaching experience in multicultural settings did not affect teachers' perception. Rather, S-A Yoo (2011) said that these teachers came to pursue assimilative education. As teachers directly faced with the problems or issues of multicultural students, they accepted realistic solutions such as emphasizing students' academic achievement.

CRITICAL MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

As there has been a claim that social justice and equity should be at the heart of education (May & Sleeter, 2010; McLaren, 2000), theoretical and scholarly works have developed several critical approaches to transform education. Among them, critical multiculturalism is one of the comprehensive, applicable theories in education (May, 2009). Thus, this dissertation adopts critical multiculturalism as a yardstick to discuss how teachers (re)form their sociocultural identities and how they practice in multicultural classrooms. This section discusses key aspects of critical multiculturalism and its application for education in school systems and curriculum.

Critical Multiculturalism

> [Critical] multiculturalism does not see diversity itself as a goal but rather argues that diversity must be affirmed within a politics of cultural criticism and a commitment to social justice. It must be attentive to the notion of difference. Difference is always a product of history, culture, power, and ideology. Differences occur between and among groups and must be understood in terms of the specificity of their production. Critical multiculturalism interrogates the construction of difference and identity in relation to a racial politics (McLaren, 2000, p. 221).

Critical multiculturalism actively challenges unequal power relationships and institutionalized inequities and injustice "including but not necessarily limited to racism" (May & Sleeter, 2010, p 10). This critical multiculturalism is a result of criticizing other multicultural approaches, such as conservative, liberal (benevolent), pluralist, and left-essentialist multiculturalism (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; May 2009; McLaren, 2000). It also stems from integrating and advancing other critical approaches, such as antiracist education, critical race theory, and critical pedagogy (Banks, 2009; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; May 2009; May & Sleeter, 2010; McLaren, 2000; Nieto, 2009). Based on prominent scholars' analyses and evaluations of critical multiculturalism, four aspects are noticeable as key conceptions.

First, critical multiculturalism resists the tacit canon or norms sustained by power relations based on white supremacy. Conservative or liberal multiculturalism emphasize common culture, common humanity, sameness, and universalism (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; McLaren, 2000); even pluralist multiculturalism, which focuses on differences, eventually emerges as a form of common good and common sense (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997). Yet, both the "sameness" of conservative or liberal multiculturalism and the "difference" of pluralist or left-liberal multiculturalism are rooted in Eurocentric

assimilationist ideology (Banks, 2009), which is oppressively universalistic and ethnocentric humanism (McLaren, 2000). This notion of norms demands that people from different backgrounds abandon their original cultures and languages (Banks, 2009); further, the notion blames those who do not belong to the boundaries of the mainstream in terms of class, race, and gender (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997). This process aims to maintain and protect national identities and the cultural hegemony of existing dominant groups while the dominant groups exploit the strong appeal of social and economic mobility (Banks, 2009). However, critical multiculturalism rejects this universalism of the mainstream and replaces it with particularism (May, 1999). Further, it forces the dominant group to see their culture from the perspectives of various groups and attempts to understand how structures of race, class, and gender mediate experiences of both the privileged and the oppressed (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997).

Second, critical multiculturalism also rejects the tendency of popularizing different cultures through a form of essentialism. Essentialism is the belief that individuals or groups have a set of unchanging properties, which are immutable essences (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; Moya, 2002). It assumes a homogeneous cultural conception of an ethnic or racial group, and fixed characteristics of individuals who belong to a group with the conception of that group identity (Sleeter, 2012). Because culture is understood as a unique, static, fixed and final form by ethnic origin (McCarthy, 1998), celebrating cultures and races in the forms of food, music, and holidays imposes and reinforces stereotypical notions (Nieto, 2009). Thus, May (2009) criticized the basic essentialist assumption about ethnic or cultural "boundedness" that forces minority ethnic groups to be represented as certain beings contained within their cultures and the discourses associated with them; he refers to this as a process of "new racism" (p 37). Even though critical multiculturalism recognizes

the significance of ethnicity and culture, it views identity formation as a fluid, dynamic, malleable, multiple, and contingent process, different from authoritarianism and the narrowed view of essentialism (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997). Therefore, critical multiculturalism goes against essentialist notions of cultural differences.

Third, critical multiculturalism considers fundamental, broad, and multiple issues of social inequality. This is different from other multicultural approaches that overlook social inequity, and also unlike other critical theoretic approaches concerned with this issue. For example, antiracist theorists and critical race theorists criticize the tendency to concentrate on culture as a "deracialized discourse" (May, 2009, p 35). Instead, these theorists claim to include racism and race issues to adequately address inequality. Yet, focusing on racism has brought another argument that class issues should be emphasized as a key factor of socioeconomic inequity (May & Sleeter, 2010). However, the inequity results not only from issues of race or only from class issues; these simple categories are not sufficient to explain the fundamental inequalities. Rather, social inequity is dependent on the complicity of ideological and social contexts. Given this comprehensive critical understanding, critical multiculturalism acknowledges the complexity of relations between racism and class (McLaren & Torres, 1999); further, it acknowledges broader structural forces such as capitalism, colonialism, religion, and sexism (May, 2009).

Last, as the most central feature, critical multiculturalism adheres to social equity and social structural transformation. Its goals go beyond simply reducing prejudice and celebrating cultural diversity and differences such as holidays and heroes, which makes them appear equal (May, 2009). Instead, critical multiculturalism seeks to change policies and practices within power relations. In contrast to other multicultural approaches that are reluctant to address and analyze power asymmetries (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997),

critical multiculturalism explicitly addresses culture as a highly political reinforcement of power structures and their representation (Grant & Sachs, 2000). Thus, critical multiculturalism directly argues that power has semiotically and politically operated to legitimate social inequalities, and has economically, educationally, and institutionally shaped consciousness and behavior (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997). Therefore, against "pseudo-depoliticization" or "mere establishment of diversity as its final objective" (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997, p 13; p 26), critical multiculturalism conceptualizes diversity in the power of difference. Further, it changes unjust systems and empowers historically marginalized groups.

The Political Nature of Education

Many scholars have applied critical multiculturalism to education and critically examined the structures, principles, and nature of discourse in curriculum, and the complex relationship among curriculum, power, and society. One of the early proponents of multicultural education, James A. Banks (2009) argued that the existing inequality within society is "reflected in the curriculum, textbooks, teacher attitudes and expectations, student-teacher interactions, languages and dialects spoken and sanctioned in the schools, and school culture" (p 13). In other words, all explicit, hidden, and null curricula[1] in

[1]Explicit curriculum is officially designated by administrators, curriculum developers, or teachers. This curriculum, intentionally presented in schools, is the official, operational curriculum or the written curriculum (Jacksons, 1992; Schubert, 1986). However, this explicit curriculum may differ from what students actually learn in schools. It is the hidden curriculum, which is implicitly taught in schools through norms, values, and cultures (Bowles & Gintis, 1976). Students are socialized/injured by the very nature and organizational design of schools as well as by the behaviors and attitudes of teachers (De Lissovoy, 2012a; Longstreet & Shane, 1993). Thus, this hidden, invisible, implicit, and covert curriculum refers to the unintended outcomes students learn even though no one may recognize these subtle messages (Portelli, 1993; Vallance, 1973). Null curriculum means what schools do not teach and thus what certain students cannot access (Eisner, 2002). Because the excluded curriculum also influences students as much as the included one does, the omission is a certain choice related to students' learning. From these three aspects,

school reinforce the status quo and the dominant power relationships in society. They neither challenge the discrimination in schools and society, nor help students understand the ways their lives are influenced by social systems (Banks, 2008). Using the concept of Bourdieu's cultural capital, McLaren (1998) also argued that schools systematically value and reward those with dominant cultural capital, but devalue the other students in subordinate class positions. Thus, he insisted that curriculum is where power operates visibly through expectations and desires of formal public criteria, and also invisibly through the ways dominant groups think of themselves and act (Grant, 2008).

In this regard, Giroux (2007) claimed the non-neutral nature of curriculum, which selectively produces knowledge, values, and identities as a hierarchical system. He pointed out that the role of schools is to instill a misconception that these issues and problems can be solved by "raising test scores, promoting choice, developing a national curriculum, and creating a uniform standard of national literacy" (Giroux, 2000, p 203). Apple (2008) also cautioned against schools, which have been the place of power conflicts "about the kind of knowledge that is and should be taught, about whose knowledge is official, and about who has the right to decide what is to be taught, how it is organized, and how teaching and learning are to be evaluated" (p 25). Thus, curriculum in school systems has served as a means of cultural reproduction; it has taken a role of cultural gatekeeper for transmitting dominant values and protecting the common culture (Kincheloe & Steinberg; 1997). Popkewitz (1997) even defined curriculum as "a disciplining technology that directs how

---

Grant (2008) defined curriculum as "much more than what is in textbooks and more than a special unit or lesson plan that a teacher develops. Instead, curriculum includes all of the 'experiences' and 'learning opportunities' of the school" (p 890). Therefore, in this study, curriculum refers to the entire range of experiences students encounter in schools, including experiences from which students are excluded. In this study, it is a synonym for school education.

the individual is to act, feel, talk, and 'see' the world and 'self'… a form of social regulation" (p 132).

However, this political nature of education, the relationship between knowledge and power, has been ignored (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997); instead, silence about the schools' oppression has been maintained even though students are alienated from school and suffer achievement gaps (Sleeter, 2012). Hence, out of the notion that curriculum represents objective and value-free knowledge that is beneficial to all students, critical multicultural education critically investigates the politics of the curriculum, a site of power. It proposes these questions: how does curriculum reproduce the social inequality that results from the unequal distribution of power and privilege? How does curriculum limit the opportunity of those who are not in the dominant group? How do complex power relations and struggles among diverse groups result in legitimate knowledge? How does the curriculum privilege some groups over others while treating cultural narrative and national history in fixed and narrow terms, and How does the curriculum work to secure specific forms of cultural authority while simultaneously working to silence and marginalize specific groups of students (Apple, 1977; Giroux, 2000)? In other words, critical multicultural education continues to ask where knowledge comes from, who verifies that knowledge, and what political impact it has (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997).

Critical Multicultural Curriculum

Critical multicultural education is a transformative movement with a high sensitivity to larger political, economic, cultural, and ideological processes and relations. It fundamentally uncovers social problems, and engages and transforms diverse histories, cultural narratives, institutions, and representations (Giroux, 2000). Critical multicultural

education eventually discusses how to conduct social action and promote alternative choices. Grant and Sleeter (2007) claimed that critical multicultural education is a powerful avenue by which the history of inequities, racial equality, and cultural diversity are presented to students. Therefore, critical multicultural education aims to challenge the explicit curriculum, emphasize the hidden curriculum, and transform the null curriculum. Critical multicultural education enables students from all different backgrounds to be empowered within an equal opportunity to learn as well to acquire the information, social action skills, and values needed to challenge inequality and to create a just society (Banks, 2008). Toward that end, critical multicultural education allows students to critically explore different cultures and their historical and social contexts, and to know how to conduct social action and promote alternative choices (Banks, 2009; Sleeter & Grant, 2003).

Therefore, critical multicultural curriculum means more than merely re-presenting cultural differences or simply analyzing stereotypes (Giroux, 2000). It approaches cultural difference as not something to be tolerated, but as a fundamental source of agency and possibility for social justice. Also, the curriculum places the assets students bring into the classroom at the center as valuable and valid knowledge. The center of this curriculum is shared by different cultural groups (Grant 2008) and affirms students' diverse cultures including race, ethnicity, social class, languages, sexuality, and religions (Grant& Sleeter, 2007; Grant, 2008). Thus, this curriculum transforms the existing curriculum that has served power and the dominant group. Its central work is challenging the hegemony and ideology of the dominant mainstream group through addressing a new discourse about differences and social systems. It develops a new dialogue in which power and resources are reallocated for those who have been systematically excluded and denied, and in which a relationship between unity and difference is rearticulated beyond simplistic binarism

(Giroux, 2000). The counter-discourse that challenges the typical narrative of the mainstream curriculum contributes to creating a critical multicultural curriculum (Brown & Brown, 2012). Kincheloe and Steinberg argued for subjugated knowledge to understand "how power shapes their lives and what they can do to resist its oppressive presence" (p 28) and to "challenge the invisible cultural assumptions embedded in all aspects of schooling and knowledge production" (p 45).

Critical multicultural curriculum understands the world by decentering the center, viewing subjugated experience from the perspective of marginalized groups, and approaching whiteness from an outsider's point of view. For the new negotiation of difference, critical multicultural curriculum crosses ideological and political borders and explores "zones of cultural difference by moving in and out of the resources, histories, and narratives" (Giroux, 2000, p 210). Therefore, this curriculum enables students to acquire knowledge about their cultures and to view them from the perspectives of other cultures and groups; so, it help students interact and deliberate with their peers from diverse backgrounds (Banks, 2001; Banks, 2008). The curriculum prepares citizens to work actively toward social structural equality, promotes cultural pluralism and alternative life styles, and fosters equal opportunities in schools (Sleeter & Grant, 2003).

For that to occur, McLaren (1998, 2000) claimed schools should be equally open to the participation of each member of the school community and pay attention to subaltern voices. To achieve this goal, he argued that schools should be transformed into a system of participatory decision-making. For example, inspired by an example of one urban educational setting in Brazil, he argued that goals, procedures, norms, and guidelines of school should include the consent of teachers, students, educational authorities, and parents (Fischman & McLaren, 2000, p 172). To analyze alternative viewpoints, Sleeter and Grant

(2003) also called for the democratic transformation of schools: students' decision making about school-wide concerns, minority parents' participation in the school, local communication action projects, and elimination of testing that designates some students as failures. Similarly, Banks (2001) suggested a holistic paradigm for the school environment, updated from his previous model (Banks, 1981), that includes ten major variables: school policy and politics; the school culture and hidden curriculum; teaching styles and strategies; the language and dialects of the school; community participation and input; the counseling program; the formalized curriculum and course of study; assessment and testing procedures; the instructional materials; and the school staff's attitudes, perceptions, beliefs, and actions.

Practical Approaches to Critical Multicultural Curriculum

Nevertheless, composing a different curriculum does not mean merely inclusion of other cultures or simply changing words or pictures in textbooks. Instead, it demands a critical investigation into the principles of curriculum production, organization, regulation, and distribution (Apple, 1995). Banks (2001) and Sleeter and Grant (2003) reviewed various types of multicultural curriculum and identified several approaches. From these various forms, they discerned an ideal critical multicultural curriculum from "the surface harmony" or "a pseudo-harmony" (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997, p 230).

Sleeter and Grant (2003) identified five types of approaches to multicultural education according to chronological analysis:

- "Teaching the exceptional and the culturally different" aims to help students succeed more effectively in a dominant traditional education. So, the curriculum is relevant to students, but tries to fit these students into the existing social structure.

- "The human relations approach" aims for every student to feel unity, tolerance, and acceptance within the existing social structure. The curriculum of this approach deals with contributions of diverse groups and individual differences and similarities.
- "The single-group studies" is concerned with the special structural equality of an identified group. With focus on a specific group's culture and oppressive context, the curriculum aims to benefit the identified group.
- "The multicultural education" celebrates human diversity and equal opportunity. The curriculum respects different groups' perspectives and enhances equal opportunity in the school. Yet, this approach mainly promotes cultural pluralism using metaphors such as "a tossed salad or a patchwork quilt" (Sleeter & Grant, 2003, p 159).
- "The multicultural and social reconstruction" approach more directly deals with oppression and social structural inequity than the other four approaches. Especially, this approach extends the multicultural education approach into the issues of social action to challenge social stratification. Thus, a curriculum designed from this approach organizes political literacy, social action skills, empowerment skills, and social issues such as racism, classism, sexism, sexuality, and disability. Ultimately, this approach aims to prepare "future citizens to reconstruct society so that it better serves the interests of all groups of people" (p 196).

Banks's (2001) model shows four approaches to integrating multicultural content into the curriculum according to levels of integration:

- "The contributions approach" includes cultural elements such as the food, dances, music, and artifacts of ethnic groups, but does not change the mainstream curriculum. It only attaches ethnic issues as "an appendage to the main story" (p 231).
- "The additive approach" adds a book, a unit, or a course to enhance diversity, but there is no reform in the basic curricular structure, purposes and characteristics. Students cannot learn enough to respond to issues and problems of diversity.

These two approaches both integrate cultural content and reflect values of the dominant culture rather than those of marginalized cultural communities. Yet, there are two other approaches that change the goals, structure, and perspectives of the curriculum in tune with critical multicultural curriculum.

- "The transformation approach" infuses various perspectives, content, and frames of reference from different groups, not just by addition. The basic assumption is that the current mainstream-centric curriculum is only one of several perspectives. Thus, it tries to enable all students to understand the complexity of culture and society, to reduce racial encapsulation and to have a balanced view, and to be empowered in schools. Moreover, this approach aims to teach students "to think critically and to develop the skills to formulate, document, and justify their conclusions and generalizations" (Banks, 2002, p 31).
- "The decision-making and social action approach" extends the transformative curriculum by enabling students to make decisions and to take personal, social, and civic actions related to the concept, issue, or problem they have studied. The main goal of this approach is to help students "acquire political efficacy" (Banks, 2001,

> p 236) through empowering them for social criticism and social change. This curriculum positions the excluded groups as full participants in society while presenting the decision-making skills and knowledge needed to participate in social change and social criticism. In other words, it offers an education in the ways to close the gap between ideals and social realities and the ways to influence the social and political system.

These approaches toward critical multicultural education, along with the theoretical concerns above, provide the researcher with a lens to examine how the participants in this study understand and teach multicultural education.

In this chapter, I presented a broad view of South Korea's cultural context and approach to multicultural education. Relying on the concept of Holland et al. (1998), I described the classroom as a figured world into which teachers cast themselves. I also provided a theoretical sketch of the process of sociocultural identity negotiation with cultural resources. Furthermore, by reviewing what the existing scholarship has discussed about critical multicultural education, I attempted to lay the groundwork for critical discussion about teachers' sociocultural identities.

Chapter 3

Methodology

The purpose of this study is to explore teachers' sociocultural identities and their teaching practice with regards to identity formation process. I examined sociocultural identities of teachers in South Korea and their teaching practice in elementary multicultural classrooms. This study was an opportunity to look at how teachers' cultural identities are negotiated through their teaching practice in the figured world of multicultural education. This negotiation was scrutinized through the lens of critical multicultural education. The question guiding my study is:

1. How do elementary South Korean teachers negotiate their own sociocultural identities through their teaching with multicultural background students?

I answered this question by interviewing four teachers and observing their teaching in multicultural classrooms.

RESEARCH PARADIGM

There is no research that is not guided by a certain paradigm. Glesne (2011) noted that a paradigm is "a framework or philosophy of science that makes assumptions about the nature of reality and truth, the kinds of questions to explore, and how to go about doing so" (p 5). In other words, ontology (beliefs of reality) and epistemology (nature of knowledge) are embedded in a researcher's assumptions and underpin the theoretical perspective of his or her research. In turn, this philosophical stance provides logic and criteria for the methodology (Crotty, 1999). Thus, these linking chains guide the kind of

work the researcher chooses to do in his/her research, and help ensure the research's soundness and rigor.

This study is grounded in the epistemology of socio-constructionism (Crotty, 1999). Socio-constructionism proposes another way of knowing meanings. It rejects objectivism which regards meaning as reality existing apart from the operation of any consciousness; thus, it denies objective truth which just waiting for to be discovered. Instead, socio-constructionism views that "all knowledge, and therefore all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context" (Crotty, 1999, p 42). Thus, socio-constructionism views that subject and object interact as partners in the construction of meaning. As already discussed with the concept of sociocultural identities in Chapter Two, this study regarded the negotiation of sociocultural identities as neither fully object process nor subject process. Instead, teachers' sociocultural identities was studied as social products through the perspective of social-constructionism. Hence, the *social*, here, indicates the mode of meaning generation rather than the kind of object that has meaning.

Furthermore, this study did not accept the status quo or seek merely to understand meaning. Instead, the epistemology in this study was embodied through the critical inquiry perspective, which goes beyond understanding to challenging the status quo and to bringing about change (Crotty, 1999; Glesne, 2011; Lincoln et al, 2011). The critical perspective acknowledges the social construction of knowledge, but further criticizes the effects of power relations. This perspective challenges the unequal practice that dominant cultural knowledge promotes and controls other forms of knowledge. Thus, this critical perspective pays attention to the constraining social, cultural, ethnic, gender, political, and economic values, embedded within institutional systems, in the process of meaning construction

(Lincoln et al, 2011). In this vein, this critical inquiry perspective on the human world and social life informed my methodology and provided a context for the study. Therefore, this study adopted ethnographic narrative and then analyzed teachers' sociocultural identities and their practice, the process of teachers' negotiation of sociocultural identities, and institutional discourse or norms in the world of multicultural education into which teachers enter.

ETHNOGRAPHIC NARRATIVE

Based on the socio-constructionist epistemology and critical inquiry perspective, this research, studying cultural identities and teaching practices in a multicultural educational world, employed narrative inquiry along with an ethnographic form of inquiry. Narrative inquiry is a form of qualitative research that analyzes "first-person accounts of experience told in story form" (Merriam, 2002, p 9). Narrative is a product of experience (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990) as well as an inquiry process as a way of knowing what something is like (Goddall, 2008).

Narrative has been applied in numerous studies about teachers' identities because of the nature of identity and story (Connelly & Clandinin, 1999; Ritchie & Wilson, 2000; Tsui, 2011; Watson, 2006; Zembylas, 2003). Since humans are "storytelling organisms" (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, p 2), identity is a fluid process residing in stories (Collier & Thomas, 1988) and narrative is how we make sense of what we experience in the world in which we live (Souto-Manning, 2014). Moreover, Sfard and Prusak (2005) equate identities with narratives of persons, so they even stated persons are stories. Thus, stories are a window into teachers' identities (Ryan & Bernard, 2000) and embody their understanding of experience, and ultimately of themselves and the world. In this respect,

narrative, in which the narrator reveals self, his/her complexity and uniqueness (Kramp, 2004), was an appropriate methodology for this research that investigate teachers' sociocultural identities.

Even though narratives are definitely the micro personal stories of experience, narratives also provide a researcher understanding of macro public, political, economic, social, cultural, and historical contexts (Glensne, 2011; Goodson & Sikes, 2001). Narratives illustrate that how institutional and power discourses in society affect the narrators' experiences in the life world in more concrete ways (Souto-Manning, 2014). Because narratives are also social products from socio constructionist epistemology, they are a significant means to understand not only the narrators, but also the social construction process within institutional discourses and cultural norms (Ochs & Capps 2001). Narratives, connecting micro personal events to macro social contexts (van Dijk 1993), show how people figure out themselves in social venues. Therefore, the main attraction of narrative as a method is "its capacity to render life experiences, both personal and social, in relevant and meaningful ways" (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, p 10). Hence, narrative from the critical perspective enabled this study to scrutinize teachers' negotiation of sociocultural identities in the worlds. This critical stance illuminated how the world of multicultural education was constructed and practiced in South Korea and how teachers in South Korea negotiated their sociocultural identities with regards to multicultural social and educational change.

In addition to narrative, ethnographic approach was also employed in this study. This approach is suitable for studying human society and culture: how people construct and share meaning and how culture such as beliefs, values and attitudes shapes the people's behavior in a particular group (Glesne, 2011; Merriam, 2002). Thus, the ethnographic approach was necessary to understand the sociocultural world of multicultural education

in which the participant-teachers casted themselves as well as their teaching practice which might be cultural resources in the figured world. Yet, the ethnographic approach was handled as supplementary, merging methods with narrative inquiry, which is the main methodology. What ethnographic study means here are ethnographic field methods of observations and artifact collections. However, as Merriam (2002) stated, ethnography is not about how data are collected, but rather this methodology is defined by the lens of a sociocultural interpretation of the data. For instance, Creswell (2009) stated that the core of ethnographic research is a description and understanding of cultural or social works and lives in the collective world. Thus, I relied on ethnographic inquiry to grasp the "thick description" (Geertz, 1973) needed for sociocultural understanding of the world of South Korean multicultural education and the teachers' identities negotiated through teaching practice. Moreover, from the critical perspective, this ethnographic approach led me to describe "what could be" beyond "what is" (Thomas, 1993; cited in Glesne, 2011, p 9). The thick description gathered by ethnographic methods created a space to critically discuss the data with regards to critical multicultural education.

PARTICIPANTS AND RESEARCH SITES

This study was conducted with elementary-school teachers in D region of South Korea. Three schools in different contexts and four teachers with different cultural backgrounds were recruited to get various, rich data. This study did not aim to yield generalizable explanations or a set of principles of teachers' sociocultural identities; instead, it aimed to produce a thick description of dynamic feature of the sociocultural identities negotiation process in naturally teaching setting. The following is the rationale for the selection of the four participants and the three research sites.

Participants

I recruited four teachers in elementary schools of South Korea from D region. These participants were teachers who directly taught multicultural background students. Although multicultural background means diversity in race, class, culture, abilities, native language, religion, etc., I planned to select teachers who served the multicultural students belonging to the two categories confined by the Ministry of Education: students from binational families and students from two foreign parents. It was because of my expectation that the teachers would be more exposed to the multicultural educational context of South Korea. Since this study intended to explore a fluid process of teachers' negotiation over their sociocultural identities as they entered into a figured world, I arranged participants while prioritizing this requirement. In addition, I designed to include a bilingual teacher. As I mentioned before in the previous chapter, the racially homogenous group of teachers in South Korea has been changed and begun to introduce diverse racial background teachers for a position of bilingual teacher. In order to reflect this shift of teacher composition and to explore a non-South Korean teacher's sociocultural identity, one bilingual teacher was a subject of this study. In regard to gender, I planned to recruit one male teacher for the study to reflect the gender ratio of the D region's teacher population. In the region, 81% of teachers were women and only 19% were male teachers. Teachers' socioeconomic backgrounds or their school experiences as students would be important for their sociocultural identities, but these various backgrounds were not considered in recruiting process. Also, even though backgrounds of multicultural students whom participants taught might hold a crucial meaning in relation to their sociocultural

understanding, I did not consider the multicultural students' backgrounds because the information was not accessible during recruiting process.

I purposefully recruited teachers using a convenience and snowball sampling procedure (Glesne, 2011; Patton, 2002). First, in order to obtain permission to contact teachers, I asked the principals or directors of any schools that were assigned as exemplary multicultural schools in D region because it meant the schools had multicultural students.[2] When I was allowed, I provided teachers information about this study's purpose and requirements. Second, I requested several teachers already acquainted with me to ask participation if they had (a) multicultural student(s). In addition, I also asked them to recommend their fellow teachers for this study. When there were voluntary applicants, I selected four participants including one bilingual teacher and one male teacher. The entire recruiting procedure was processed via emails and telephone during May 2013.

The four participant-teachers were two homeroom teachers, one single subject teacher, and one bilingual teacher. The former three teachers were South Koreans and coincidently graduated from the same college of education; the last teacher was a Korean-Chinese who was born and grew up in China. An overview of the four participants, according to self-identification, is presented in the table 2. What I want to note is that their former three teachers' positions—i.e., grade, homeroom teacher or subject teacher—were changing every year. Because each single teacher in public schools of South Korea moves to another school in the same district or region every four or five years, school leadership

[2]The 2012 plan of multicultural education included a policy to operate 150 exemplary schools for multicultural education nation-wide; 30 schools are "Global leading schools" and 120 schools are "Central schools" (The Ministry of Education, 2012a). Global leading schools, selected by the Ministry of Education, operate with high focus on multicultural education for a year and a half year (from June 2012 to February 2014). Another 120 central schools are selected by each office of education and operated for every year. The D region had 5 exemplary schools in 2013.

usually assign the entire teacher's position—i.e., grade, homeroom teacher or subject teacher—every year.

Name	Age	Race	Gender	Teaching experience	Position
Sae-Ra	28	Korean	Female	5 years	Homeroom teacher of 2nd Grade
Do-Jin	43	Korean	Male	20 years	Music teacher for 3rd-5th grades
Seong	24	Korean	Female	First year teacher	Homeroom teacher of 3rd grade
Yoo-Jeong	45	Korean-Chinese	Female	3 years	Bilingual teacher for 1st to 6th grades

Table 2: An overview of the four participants

Research Sites

The four teachers were recruited from three public elementary schools located in D region of South Korea. The region had 22,014 foreigners, which accounts for 0.87% of the region's entire population in 2011; 12,451 of them were male and 9,563 were female. The best represented nationality was Chinese (33.90%) followed by Vietnamese (17.3%) and Indonesian (7.13%). In addition, there are Philippine, American, Taiwanese, Sri-Lankan, Pakistani, Uzbek, Cambodian, Japanese, Thai, Canadian, Mongolian, and others (in order of the numbers). According to the data of the D region office of education, there were 216 elementary schools including 4 private schools, 148,899 students, and 8,215 teachers in 2012. Among entire students, 918 students were multicultural students; 884 were children of binational marriage families and 34 were children of foreign workers' families. The countries their parents came from are China, Japan, Philippines, Vietnam, Thailand,

Taiwan, Russia, South Asia, United States, Indonesia, Mongolia, Middle east Asia, Europe, Africa, and others (in order of the numbers) (Daegu Metropolitan Office of Education, 2012a).

The three elementary schools were Valley Elementary School (Sae-Ra), Sprout Elementary School (Do-Jin and Seong), and Pebble Elementary School (Yoo-Jeong). Description of each school and the multicultural students are below, which would bring readers a glimpse of the context in which the teachers implemented their teaching practice.

Valley Elementary School

Valley Elementary School, where Sae-Ra worked, was surrounded by several spacious apartment complexes. Most of the students were from middle class backgrounds, which explained their ability to afford the nearby housing; in the case of Sae-Ra's class, there were only two students who were approved for free school lunch. The school provided 24 kinds of afterschool programs including piano, guitar, violin, magic, robotics, life science, cooking, calligraphy, etc. It had a total of 781 students in 34 classrooms (there was no special education classroom), and four students among the student body had been identified as multicultural students. The school had neither a bilingual instructor nor a teacher who was assigned the duty to manage multicultural education and multicultural students.

In Sae-Ra's 2nd-grade class, there was one multicultural student among a total of 23 students. He, Jeong-Woo, was the child of a Filipino mother and a South Korean father. According to Sae-Ra, his parents were in the process of filing for divorce, and his mother had left the house. During the first semester, his mother showed herself at the school twice: early one morning she handed Jeong-Woo a gift, and on the sports field one day she came

and took pictures of him. Sae-Ra reported that his father, a large-sized bus driver, was busy with work but cared for Jeong-Woo a lot. Whenever Sae-Ra sent a text in relation to Jeon-Woo's school activities, his father cooperatively responded each time. However, Jeong-Woo was often missing supplies or homework. After school, he had the mentorship program for multicultural students twice a week. Sae-Ra said he showed good academic achievement and mostly earned a perfect score on dictation tests; yet, he was easily distracted and received warnings from her during lessons.

Sprout Elementary School

Sprout Elementary School, where Do-Jin and Seong were working, was located next to a market square. Most students at this school were from working-class backgrounds, and there were many students from single-parent families. Do-Jin reported that more than half of the students lived in poor housing, such as old prefabricated houses built in the 1970s or 80s. Because of the students' low socioeconomic background, this school was selected as a free lunch school, so the entire student body received the benefit. There were 387 students in 20 classrooms, including two special education classrooms. The school annual reports from both 2012 and 2013 evaluated the overall students' academic achievement as low, and they mentioned that there were many extremely underachieving students. I heard the teachers at the school saying that one third of the 3rd graders had not known what 'apple' means in English.

The school had six multicultural students of binational marriage families: one's mother was Uzbekistani, another's Vietnamese, and the other four were children of Chinese women. The school had a bilingual instructor, a Korean-Chinese female. Do-Jin, a music teacher for the 3rd to 5th grades, taught three multicultural students. In the case of

Seong, a 3rd-grade homeroom teacher, she had one multicultural student in her classroom. The student, Bo-Mi, had a Chinese mother and a Korean father. Her parents were separated, and she lived with her mother. Seong reported she was very active and energetic, so she was never cowed by her classmates. She also explained that Bo-Mi's mother was busy with her work at a hospital, so she seemed less attentive to Bo-Mi. For instance, Seong mentioned that Bo-Mi had to handle any announcements or flyers from school by herself because her mother did not look at them; she wore the same, unwashed clothes to school. According to Seong, Bo-Mi, who was diagnosed with ADHD last year, was an underachieving student and ranked the lowest of her classroom on a test taken at the end of the semester. In her classroom, there were seven underachieving students among the total of 22 students.

Pebble Elementary School

Yoo-Jeong, a bilingual teacher, was working at Pebble Elementary School. There were 396 students in 21 classrooms, including two special education classrooms. The students mostly resided in the same apartment complex, which was a public rental housing for low-income families. Due to the students' low economic status, this school had been pre-approved to receive several educational benefits.

The school had 13 multicultural students. Five of them were children of North Korean refugee mothers; two of these students had Chinese fathers and three had North Korean refugee fathers. Except for one student, these students were not born in South Korea but entered into South Korea via China after they were born. In particular, one 4th grader had come to South Korea just six month ago, and another 2nd grader came a year and half ago. Yoo-Jeong said the 2nd grader had difficulty speaking Korean, but the 4th

grader had none at all. In the case of the sole student who was born in South Korea, the mother did not want her child to be known as a North Korean, so she firmly requested that the school not mention his background. A department head teacher at the school cautioned me not to even approach the student when I observed Yoo-Jeong's lesson in the student's classroom.

The other seven multicultural students were children of immigrant mothers and South Korean fathers. The mothers were from China, the Philippines, and Vietnam. There was one student who had an immigrant father, a Canadian, and a Korean mother. Yoo-Jeong said that the multicultural students were not distinguishable by appearance except one, a child of a Filipino mother; only this student was noticeable as a multicultural student by appearance due to her dark skin color. Among the total of 13 multicultural students, Yoo-Jeong said five students had poor academic performance.

The 2013 school report stated that these multicultural students adapted to school life very well and were able to communicate in Korean. Yet, it evaluated their academic achievement as relatively low due to a lack of fluency in the Korean language. Based on this evaluation, this school had applied for a research grant to increase the multicultural students' language ability. The school was selected for the research, supported by the D Regional Office of Education for two years. The semester I visited the school was the first semester of this two-year study. Thus, the school attempted various related activities in order to foster a multicultural school atmosphere. It modified the existing textbooks and developed modified lesson plans reflecting multicultural elements; a reading club for multicultural students was initiated; and a Vietnamese mother of one multicultural student gave a short lesson on the Vietnamese language to each class. Further, the school applied for a translator-helper service for one student, who was the only one eligible for the benefit.

DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION

All methods for data collection, including formal interviews, informal interviews, observations, and document collection, were conducted during the May 2013 to July 2013. The academic year in South Korea is from March 1st to February 28th. Thus, when I started my research in three schools, the teachers had already been teaching in the classrooms for two months and a half.

Each participant engaged in four formal semi-structured interviews, and each interview took one hours to two hours. Every interview was audio-recorded and held at the teachers' classrooms or other convenient location in their school. The first interview occurred at the beginning of the research and focused on the teacher's life history. Narratives of life history are extensive records of a person's life as autobiography (Geiger, 1986). Collected data on the life experiences of the teachers provided me abundant understandings of how these teachers lived within sociocultural contexts and what kinds of cultural backgrounds they had. From their childhood to their decision to be elementary teachers, and to teaching experiences, the teachers freely told their stories. Additionally I asked questions directly related to the teachers' cultural backgrounds if these did not organically emerge.

The second and third interviews were conducted after doing two or three classroom observations. These semi-structured interviews aimed to understand how teachers made sense of their teaching practice and their situated worlds of multicultural education. I asked the questions related to teachers' teaching contexts and the thoughts they held about their practices and their beings. These interviews were mainly based on the results from observations of teachers' teaching in classrooms, but also included related events, policies, activities, and circumstances that teachers faced in their teaching practice. Further, the teachers were asked for responses to hypothetical scenarios taken from existing case

studies on multicultural education in the extant literature. This was an opportunity to explore expanded or another aspect of teachers' cultural identities and the negotiation process of them beyond the discussion depended on observations.

The last interview was taken before the last observations. I asked needed questions to clarify any responses in the previous three times interviews. Also, more comprehensive questions targeted at the research question were dealt with to understand how teachers negotiated their understanding of themselves and social relations through teaching practice.

In addition to the four formal interviews I also conducted informal interviews with the teachers. Before, during or after observations, I invited the participants to briefly explain their approach to the lesson. These informal conversations lasted approximately 5-15 minutes per classroom observation. These informal interviews with immersive observations allowed me to notice subtle meanings of teachers' action, and to richly understand what happened and what it meant (Brodkey, 1987).

In this study, classroom observations were another important source of data. I tried to observe each teacher eight times, once a week. However, I was able to conduct five observations for Do-Jin, and four observations for Yoo-Jeong; in the case of Seong, I had seven observations. Each observation lasted for two hours to four hours during school hours. The observation schedule was dependent on the schools' or the classrooms' condition. I alternated my observations between mornings and afternoons for each teacher. During observations, I took field notes about how the participants planed curriculum, instructed, made decisions of teaching, interacted with students and parents, responded to students, discussed multicultural issues with other teachers, etc. The collected data from observations offered me insight about the multicultural educational contexts, their sociocultural understandings, and how they reconciled their sociocultural identities.

Additionally, I collected documents and artifacts related teachers' teaching as supplementary data. The documents included: curricular guides and/or instructional plans, teaching materials, textbooks, achievement assessments, classroom or school websites, newsletters, school annual plans, official documents from offices of education, etc.

DATA ANALYSIS

I analyzed three kinds of data: narratives from formal and informal interviews, observation field notes, and collected documents and artifacts. Among them, narratives were the distinctive data in my research and each story was the basic unit of analysis as the heart of narrative analysis (Patton 2002; Kramp, 2004). There are three narrative analysis approaches: psychological, biographical, and linguistic (or discourse) analysis (Merriam, 2002). The psychological analysis approaches stories as internal thoughts, motivation and development; the biographical approach analyzes stories with a focus on the importance and influence of experiences or events in person's life such as family of origin or social relations. Lastly, linguistic or discourse analysis examines and assesses the intonation, pitch, and pauses to look for meanings of text embedded in language of social practice. Even though each approach highlights a certain aspects of narratives, this study did not adhere to a specific approach of three categories; rather, I comprehensively adopted all three approaches in order to mostly convey the meanings according to stories.

The process of narrative analysis began with the story and ended with it. Once I gathered data, I repeatedly read and reread the transcripts of interviews so that I could attend carefully to each story and engage the whole story. Repeated readings enabled me to be aware of the language used by each narrator (Fontana & Frey, 2008) and to familiarize myself with the narrator's story itself (Kramp, 2004). Throughout careful line-by-line

reading of narratives, I marked chunks of text out for large blocks of meanings. These were the basic units of analysis that reflected a single theme and did not overlap. From these chunks of narratives, I identified themes beginning with a careful reading of the verbatim narrative, I sought to discover themes and their relationships, and then I linked them into a pattern or structure. This coding was analysis itself. The steps of coding analysis were preceded as follows.

First, I found and identified possible themes. The possible themes were initially generated by theoretical framework of my study. Sociocultural theory of identity guided me to look at data with several themes in mind, such as improvisation, space of authoring, semiotic mediation, positional identity, relational identity, and figured identity. Critical multiculturalism also brought me the topics of critical consciousness, school environment, discourses on multicultural education and students, political nature of curricular planning and enactment, etc. Those themes or topics were the lenses that I adopted to analyze data at the first level. Next, besides these theoretical themes, other major themes were directly induced from the narrative itself. As I kept examining each unit, the particular theme emerged and became clear from each narrative (Kramp, 2004). These themes elaborated on the themes from theoretical framework and also highlighted the differences from theoretical themes.

After I identified all themes, the following step was revealing how these themes are linked to each other (Ryan & Bernard, 2000). The relationships among themes led me to weave each theme together and create a structure or a pattern. The process of theme structuring embodied comparing and contrasting themes and concepts. This constant comparison throughout the narrative was the way I investigated links between themes while I asked questions such as "when, why, and under what conditions do these themes occur in the text?" (Ryan & Bernard, 2000, p 783). Through the constant comparison, every

theme was resorted and refined, and they were split into subthemes (Ryan & Bernard, 2000). This connection between themes suggested a holistic description of the teachers' negotiation experiences (Kramp, 2004). This development and refinement of themes were the central work of my narrative analysis.

Field notes, documents, artifacts were analyzed through a similar process. The contents of the data were treated like texts in narratives. All data was documented, and read and marked with labels. First, they were divided into most basic meaningful components and open coding process identified line-by-line. Then, general patterns or ideas were found as axial coding and focused coding process. Last, the data was organized into themes. The themes from these data were compared the themes from narratives, and all of them mutually complemented one another.

TRUSTWORTHINESS

The quality of research can be evaluated by how much the procedures and results of study are rigorous and convincing (Mertens, 2005; Chilisa, 2012). This trustworthiness enables the researcher and readers to feel confident about the study. Thus, I designed this study to be credible, dependable, and confirmable using several strategies: triangulation, member checks, peer debriefing, and reflexivity (Creswell, 1998).

First, I drew data from multiple sources. This is referred to as triangulation and it serves as a way to checking the integrity of the interpretation and inferences (Schwandt, 1997). Since I used more than one source from more than one case, I was able to earn more complex perspectives; in other words, I was able to expand my scope which I noticed and interpreted the phenomena. Thus, gathering four different sources of data (formal, informal interviews, observations, and documents or artifacts) promoted trustworthiness.

Second, the collected data and analyzed data were confirmed by member checks. I incorporated member checking during my research period to correct misunderstandings or misrepresentations by utilizing each of my meetings with the participants to follow up on ideas that I had questions about (Glesne, 2011). The participants' comments and additional explanations helped me understand and represent data accurately. Additionally, I used peer debriefing as well to assure trustworthiness. Especially, the supervision of a professor and committee members assisted the research process to be trustworthy through providing external reflection for the entire process of study including data analysis and writing up.

As a researcher, I tried to critically reflect on my subjectivity and positionality to enhance trustworthiness. This study, a qualitative research rooted in socio-constructionism, cannot be independent or isolated from the researcher's epistemology and perspective. As Glesne (2011) noted, it is impossible for researchers to escape from their subjectivity and positionality because no one can get rid of the subjective self. That is, subjectivity and positionality are not "lenses" that I could put on and take off, but "the complex and shifting intersections of identity" (Glesne, 2011, p 154). Indeed, as an integral condition of research, subjectivity and positionality of researcher shaped the inquiry and outcomes (Goodley, 1996).

Moreover, the researcher's personal involvement was the very condition of narrative inquiry (Kramp, 2004). Narrators and their narratives are significantly and profoundly influenced by how the researcher presents the self and what culture the researcher represents (Fontana & Frey, 2008). Connelly and Clandinin (1990) also acknowledged that "narrative inquiry is a process of collaboration involving mutual storytelling and restoring as the research proceeds" (p 4). Thus, each story can differ depending on who is telling it, who is being told, as well as when and where the story is

told. Thus, extracting the researcher's voice or perspectives crumbled the foundation of narrative.

However, the vital effects of subjectivity and positionality do not mean that I was allowed to study in a haphazard or non-systematic way. Rather, I had to examine and reexamine my perspectives and "how that subjectivity reflects upon its own power position, choices, and effects" (Madison, 2005, p 8). Through contextualizing my own positionality, I judged and evaluated how my subjectivity and positionality interacted with and influenced research participants, setting, and research procedures (Glesne, 2011). For instance, I critically reflected on how my subjectivity led me to ask certain questions and to make certain interpretations instead of other questions or interpretations. With this reflective questioning, I was mindful of enabling and disabling of positionality (Peshkin, 1988), i.e., whom I served as generating particular data, behaving in particular ways, and developing particular interpretations (Glesne, 2011).

In addition, as another way to enhance trustworthiness, I tried to protect the privacy and confidentiality of the participants. To a large extent, trustworthiness also depends upon research ethics (Merriam, 2002). The security and agency participants feel somewhat determine how much they reveal their experiences and thoughts. For the reason, I informed the participants of their right to control the nature of her own responses to the researcher's questions, the scheduling of classroom observation, and the extent to which stories they would share with me. Also, to protect confidentiality, I guaranteed the participants' anonymity. At the same time, as reciprocity, I acknowledged the participants' cooperation, expressed the study's dependence on their participation, and elaborated my pleasure and thanks with the teachers (Glesne, 2011).

RESEARCHER POSITIONALITY

As discussed above, a researcher is "an instrument" (Merriam, 2002, p 5), which influences the whole process of inquiry from deciding on the research topic to writing up the analysis (Goodley, 1996; Stanley & Slattery, 2003). The threads of researchers' lives and positionality are inevitably woven into their research (Johnson-Bailey, 2004). Thus, my positionality, comprehensive positions or placement I had relative to the research or to other participants (Hay, 2005), were a considerable issue: my cultural background, gender, age, educational background, academic discipline, life experiences, etc. (deMarrais & Tisdale, 2002). My positionality could be understood as insider and outsider relationship to the researched participants (Delgado-Gaitan, 1993; Villenas, 1996). However, this distinguishment does not mean binary opposition; rather, it highlights the multiplicity of positionality, both as an insider and an outsider. Because people are multifaceted and shift by various factors, anyone is an insider and an outsider to a particular community at many different levels, times, and points (Johnson-Bailey, 2004; Villenas, 1996).

In regard to this study, I too was also an insider and an outsider simultaneously. I had been a public school teacher for four years in South Korea and I legally maintained a position of a teacher. I have studied curriculum and instruction in my master and doctoral program for six years. As an insider, I acknowledged the importance of teachers and how much they were competent and committed to teaching, and I understood how much they struggled under the oppressive accountability systems in South Korea. I am also Korean. Prior to coming to the U.S., I had been totally blind to any challenges or difficulties related to multicultural issues similarly to most current teachers in South Korea. Moreover, with regards to multicultural teaching experience, I had not had any idea of what it meant to be a teacher for multicultural students. The climate of common ground between participants and me contributed to my research. Narrative inquiry is mutual work that is a process of

collaboration involving the mutual relationship of narrators and a researcher (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990); so, the level of a researcher's understanding about participants and the context expands the scope and depth of research. Therefore, I easily understood why the teachers remained silent in a particular interview topic, or what kind of openness and willingness they possessed in speaking honestly. Equally important to note, however, is that while my insider experiences provide certain benefits, they also posed some risk. For instance, I might have the tendency to see the narratives from my viewpoint instead of the teachers.' I cannot deny that I was in danger of misunderstanding participants' responses with an assumed picture of South Korean teachers' teaching in multicultural classrooms, which I already had due to my positionality.

However, in another way, I was an outsider in terms of multicultural education in South Korea. I had not taught in more than six years, so I did not have a clear sense of what current education in South Korea looked like. Moreover, while I was teaching and studying in South Korea, I never had any conversation about multicultural issues with any teachers. In contrast, since the Korean society and schools have rapidly changed and worked with many multicultural students, teachers have been currently attending to the cultural issues and having their own experiences and thoughts. As a result, I needed to carefully approach the ways I posed questions and interpreted stories. Along with this attention, I devoted my efforts to building rapport and trust in participant-teachers. Thus, I attended to teachers as agents of subjective understanding of the experiences and willingly challenged my own concepts (Geiger, 1986; Goodley, 1996).

I was also an outsider from my three South Korean participant-teachers regarding direct multicultural experiences. I have personally lived as a multicultural student and a mother of multicultural students. As I already untangled the story in Chapter One, after coming to the U. S. for a study, living in a foreign country as a socioeconomic-cultural

minority has enabled me to personally experience multicultural issues along with the experience in the schools of my children. I have been able to understand the sociocultural aspects of race, language, and class; I have experienced the negotiation of my cultural identities. Thus, the multicultural experiences as a student and a mother, which I have encountered as an outsider, enable me critically reflect teachers' teaching practice. Therefore, my outsider positionality played out in my research and offered a rich, unique insight.

In sum, I occupied a multiplicity of positionality, both as an insider and an outsider. Each position offered potential strengths and challenges to my research. Throughout the procedure of this study, I tried to critically reflect on my multiplicity of positionality and how the complexity and tensions are entangled in the working of research.

Chapter 4

The World: Multicultural Society and Education

In Chapter Two, I generally explained the recent multicultural contexts of South Korea, describing the scenes of social change resulting from the increase in ethnic diversity, and roughly outlined the current conditions of multicultural education in South Korea. This chapter looks more closely at the historical, social, and educational details of multicultural context as it deeply relates to teachers' sociocultural understanding. When teachers enter into the world of multicultural society and education, they inevitably encounter the assumptions or norms that exist within the world. Interestingly, teachers are not only exposed to the frame but they are also expected to play a particular role in order to correspond to that frame. In other words, the currently operating societal and educational systems impart knowledge to teachers and certainly influence teachers' sociocultural understanding and practices. In this regard, Chapter Four scrutinizes the governing framework, before looking at their sociocultural identities and teaching practices in the following chapters.

This chapter begins with an historical analysis of the overall multicultural contexts of South Korea regarding social class, race, and multicultural populations. After searching for the origins of the general multicultural perception of South Koreans, it presents four dominant multicultural discourses. First, an overarching discourse affecting the other three will be described. The grasp of the general atmosphere of multicultural social context will help readers to understand the advent and direction of multicultural education as well as the particular social interpretation about multicultural students. Later, three areas of multicultural education that are most directly related to teachers are examined from varying

angles, meso, macro, and micro levels: educational policies, curriculum, and teacher education. In order to analyze the actual practice and the concrete features of multicultural education in relation to the individual participant-teachers, data were gleaned from the observations and interviews in addition to the national and regional documents. The specific phenomena from the cases of participant-teachers will contribute to a clear illumination of the frame of the multicultural education and multicultural students.

THE HISTORICAL CONTEXTS OF MULTICULTURAL SOCIETY

Before examining multicultural discourses in South Korean society, the historical backgrounds inducing the discourses are reviewed. Although this study does not have enough space to present them and a full picture of them is beyond this study, I believe the contexts are necessary to understand the roots of the multicultural discourses.

Social Class

According to the documentary record, static cast systems existed in Korea since before the 1st century.[3] Even though these systems had been changed throughout royal regimes or dynasties during countries' long history, they had common traditional features: the underlying idea that status is determined by birth, discriminatory practices toward low-status groups in every sphere of their lives, the exclusive privileges of high-class families, and the difficulty in changing one's status (Y-C Lee, 2007; I-S Park, 2001). When the legal

[3]The first record, telling about the existence of different social class, is found from the laws of Gojoseon in ancient times. From Silla (18 BC -935 AD) to Goryeo (918-1392) and Joseon (1392-1897), each dynasty established its own social class system. In 1894, by the time of the Gabo Reform, which banned discrimination based on class, the class system was legally abolished (K-M Hwang, 2004).

feudal cast system was abolished in 1894, another status system, which was slightly based on modern industrial capital but still heavily rooted in feudal landholding, soon replaced the previous one during the Japanese colonial period, 1910-1945 (K-Y Shin, 1999). After Korea's independence from Japan, the US military government, which settled in Southern Korea from 1945 to 1948, maintained the existing social class system, merely replacing the Japanese ruling group with a group of Korean high class (J-G Kang, 1992). By that time, landowner-tenant power relations still continued as the core hierarchy because the social economy mostly depended on agriculture.

However, after the land reform (1950) and the Korean War (1950-1953), radical social change destroyed the feudal system.[4] Driven by dictatorial governments, South Korea rapidly turned to industrial society from agriculture; thus, an economic capital-based status structure was introduced in the society. Because of government-driven development, the capitalist class established a strong relationship with the politicians, resulting in the political and economic sway of the bourgeois. Meanwhile, the sudden industrialization resulted in the precipitous appearance of the proletariat. Later, due to continuing industrial development and neoliberal economics trends, the ruling classes were absorbed in fortifying their privileges. Thus, the social structure has primarily determined individuals' comprehensive lifestyle, whether privileged or marginalized, including even their residential district and educational experience (K-Y Shin, 1999).

Consequentially, given the capitalist class system, socio-cultural economic capital has earned more value in the society, and personal worth is measured in terms of one's capital, or exchange value. Thus, individuals have become eager to gain more capital or

[4]Postwar, South Korean society finally realized that industrialization and capitalism, which can be referred to as *modernity*, were the inevitable global trend; at the same time, the society found itself behind the times. Soon, South Korea rapidly achieved economic growth, urbanization, and modernization in the 1960-1970s. The speed of this transformation is referred to as South Korea's "miracle" (Norton, 1998).

hold up the value of owned capital. However, class mobility in the modern capitalist system seldom occurs; rather, individual position has been inherited according to parents' capital (T-H Kim, 2012). Yet, there has been an agreement about one promising way for social mobility. This path, regarded as the only possible as well as the only definite way, is education. The belief also emerged from a long history in South Korea. Along with the Confucian culture emphasizing the pursuit of knowledge, the civil service examination, which began in the 7th century to appoint high status leaders, evaluated knowledge of the Confucian classics. Since the examination became available to a wider social range in 958, people from a low family background gained a small chance to pursue upward mobility through studying hard for that kind of examination. This custom of the high-status test, such as the college entry examination and civil service examination, has continued until the present. Therefore, studying has been regarded as a crucial device, or really the only mechanism to advance one's status in South Korean society (T-H Kim, 2012). The society is even referred to as an academic-capital society instead of a status-class-based society (Bourdieu, 2000; I-S Nam, 2011).

Race

The term Korean race did not clearly exist until the late 19 century because there was neither need nor room to define every Korean as "us" in the feudal cast systems (Schmid, 2012; D-H Seol, 2006). Moreover, the country's territory had kept changing in relation to China, leading to fluctuations in which populations were included (Yeom, 2009). Yet, in the face of the abolition of the cast system in 1894, Korean society finally found it necessary to create a unified identity. Moreover, the Japanese invasion, occurred at about the same time, inspired in Koreans a desperate desire for national prosperity and

military power.[5] The two combined situations gathered momentum for inventing the concept of the Korean race (S-J Bae, 2013; H Eum, 1999; T-K Kang, 2011; J-B Lee, 2012).[6] Furthermore, during the Japanese colonial period, national identity had become more empowered through resistance to colonialism. After independence, Korean society highlighted the Korean race and its purity in order to sharply separate out vestiges of Japanese imperialism (S-J Bae, 2013; G-W Shin, 2006). However, soon, dictatorial governments in the post-Japanese colonial period employed this racial identity as a form of nationalism in order to validate their political legitimacy in spite of their pro-Japanese backgrounds. Moreover, the dictatorial governments propagated nationalism with a concept of superior race, developed from the notion of the pure Korean, in order to mobilize citizens for economic development (Ha, 2012; J-B Lee, 2012; S-D Seol, 2006; Shin, 2006;).

Hence, it is an undeniable fact that this idea of *Koreanness*, shaped for political and economic purposes, has played a part in the logic of Korean superiority in South Korea (Ha, 2012). The idea explains why South Koreans differentiate themselves from other Asians or even Mongolians, and further exclude non-Koreans as others (S-D Seol, 2006; 2007). However, the superiority of pure-blood Koreans is not all of South Koreans' racial belief. On the other hand, South Koreans have a sense of inferiority within the stratified

[5]At that time, Japan had already constructed a concept of its own racial identity through distinguishing itself from other Asians and identifying with civilized whites (S-J Bae, 2013). In turn, Japan adopted a modern economic system and embarked on industrialization (Mills, 1997, p 36).

[6]Schmid (2012) described these conditions: "This was an age, after all, when active citizenship (*kumgmin*) was offered as a panacea for the nation: all the people, being equal, would work in solidarity to reform the nation. For a country that had been structured primarily around status affiliation and family lineage for several centuries, this openness itself was quite radical. The often-acclaimed power of nationalism to level social differences received one of its earliest boosts in Korea in the ideological realm. Although equality was hailed as a social goal in its own right, it was harnessed to the purpose of self-strengthening. The people were the basis of national power. Any obstacles to the participation of any social group in national life was seen as inhibiting the potential of the nation, even though in practice these calls were easier to make than to realize" (p 39).

understanding of skin color. To excavate the root of this perception, we have to go back to the late 19 century again.

When Europe had already reached the summit of its colonialism and the US was widely expanding its colonial power in the 19 century, South Korea was not excluded from this world-wide turmoil. Yet, Korea—the Joseon Dynasty at that time—adamantly blocked the influx of Western culture until the late 19 century.[7] Because the monarchy perceived white people as a threat to its own sovereign power, it firmly ostracized them. However, the Western countries did not stop their colonial ambition and kept spreading global white supremacy. This "racial contract" imposed a "wild/savage/barbarians" identity onto non-white Koreans and positioned them at a subordinated and inferior moral status (Mills, 1997, p 21). This discriminatory structure led Koreans to understand themselves as a natural sub-person and whites as first-class people. As Caucasians dominated the global share of economic, politic, and cultural privileges, the racial contract wielded more power in Korea.

Furthermore, several scholars who studied abroad in the US were indoctrinated into this notion of white supremacy and spread it across the nation (Ha, 2012; N-J Park, 2002). In turn, within one or two decades, South Korea came to acknowledge the US perspective as the predetermined official model and embraced the feeling of inferiority imposed on them (Mignolo, 2005). A newspaper article dated June 24, 1897—published in the very first newspaper by South Korean scholars—described whites as a race "which is the most clever, diligent, and courageous in the world nowadays" (S-D Seol, 2007). This white supremacy even created an image of the US as a well-intentioned world power that would protect Korea from Japan (Ha, 2012). Thus, just as Mills (1997) said, the notion of the

[7]China, which had started trade with the British Empire in the 1780s, handed over its power to Western countries after the Second Anglo-Chinese War in 1860; Japan, which had traded with the US since 1850s, switched to a modern Western system in 1868. However, the Joseon Dynasty still repelled foreign invasions; it executed a missionary from the West in 1866 and sunk a US merchant ship in 1871 (M-S Lee, 1996).

necessity for "the intervention of white men, who are thereby positioned as already sociopolitical beings" is also disseminated (p 13). This psychological colonization was accelerated during the US military government's occupation of Korea (1945-1948) and the post-Korean War. As the general public was exposed to modernized American culture and capital, the concept of white supremacy became ingrained in the society. Therefore, the pure bloodline notion came to lose its pride when confronted with displays of US modernity and civilization. Additionally, since US troops, which consisted of mostly African-Americans, have deployed in South Korea, negative images and deficit thinking on blacks initiated by whites has become more prominent among South Koreans (S-D Seol, 2007). On the other hand, this racial hierarchy in South Korea—even toward similarly colored Asians—may be explained by the case of blacks from Antilles in Frantz Fanon (2008)'s book, *Black Skins, White Masks*. As South Korea rapidly and successfully achieved modernization and economic development, which were deemed as the exclusive property of the US, South Koreans projected themselves onto whites and developed a sense of racial superiority (Ha, 2012). Therefore, they separated themselves from other developing Asian countries and denigrated less civilized/developed nations as savage, exactly as the US had done to South Korea. Therefore, between whiteness and Koreanness, South Koreans positioned themselves next to whites but much higher than any other non-whites, even higher than other Asians.

Moreover, because the socioeconomic status-based hierarchy was such a natural belief to South Koreans, they easily embodied the stratified understanding according to nations' power in international society. Hence, South Koreans complexly combined two factors—skin color and the degree of civilization—and constructed a new racial hierarchy. It read a dichotomy between South Koreas and Asians in spite of their similar skin color; so an Asian's homeland—either the middle, east, central, Southeast, west, or South Asia—

does not matter, but he/she automatically becomes just an Asian (Ha, 2012; Yeom, 2009), and these countries become no more than another "orient" to South Korea (Said, 1978).[8] This means that a different form of whiteness operates in South Korea in the face of the whiteness of the US. That is, South Korea have the racial hierarchy that is a result from the "psychological, historical, ethical, and theoretical consequence" of Western racism, imperialism, and colonialism (Mignolo, 2005, p xi).

Multicultural Populations

The considerable influx of non-Koreans into South Korea since the formation of a concept of Korean race in the late 19 century can be categorized in three stages. First, there was a wave of Japanese immigration during the Japanese colonial era. Yet, as soon as Korea became independent in 1945, most Japanese immediately embarked on ships returning to Japan (B-W Jung, 2003); otherwise, the few Japanese that remained actively assimilated themselves into Korean society (Y-S Lee, 2012). Thus, Japanese or Japanese-Koreans in South Korea went off of the social radar. A second group is the US Armed Forces who have been stationed in South Korea since the Korean War. They have been mostly African-Americans whom the South Korean masses have looked down upon. Moreover, the masses perceived the forces' South Korean brides as prostitutes who were "the lowest of the low" (Moon, 1997, p 3), so their children experienced severe social oppression. However, since most of these children were sent overseas, typically to the US, for adoption, South Korean society did not feel any need to handle this multicultural

[8]The attitude toward Japan is exceptional. Because of historical conflicts including the Japanese colonial period, South Koreans disdain the Japanese, finding their morality questionable. Thus, they maintain Korean superiority in spite of Japanese economic and technological development.

population even though the small number who remained were marginalized due to their mixed-blood (H-N Cho & E-H Park, 2013; D-H Seol, 2007).

The third and most recent foreign group has been entering South Korea since the 1990s, when neoliberalism squeezed the economy: migrant workers and migrant wives of binational marriages (H-M Kim, 2014). The number of migrants entering to South Korea has steadily increased; however, the society remained largely unaware of the growth of multicultural populations until the mid-2000s. Although many factors may explain this early inattention, most importantly, preoccupation with a sudden national financial crisis, which resulted in a bailout by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) in 1997, is believed to have been a major deterrent. While absorbed in economic recovery, the foreign populations had become larger; the social need for cheap labor was met by the migrant workforce, and the lack of marriage opportunities for disadvantaged Korean men was partially satisfied by the influx of foreign women. As the number of these migrants has increased, the society has finally came to be aware of a "multicultural" demographic trend.[9] Soon, South Koreans apply racial hierarchy on these non-whites who are perceived of as coming from less civilized countries. Moreover, applying class-based stratified-and-deficit thinking toward them, South Koreans look down on this population, which come from low-ranked countries in terms of global power and have undesirable occupations in South Korea (N-J Park, 2002). That is, the matrix of these two hierarchical understandings generates contempt for and oppression of non-white, low-class foreigners. It is an exact copy of the racialization based on skin color and degree of civilization that Western colonialism infused into Korean society, along with commercial expansion and capitalism (Mignolo,

[9]White foreigners are excluded from the boundary of "multicultural." Rather, they are recognized as those with the power to decide the norms. Thus, the expression "multicultural people" commonly refers to only immigrant workers or immigrant wives from developing countries (K-S Oh, 2007)

2005). Thus, multicultural people are recognized as those having an oriental culture but who are not civilized in South Korea.

THE DISCURSIVE CONTEXT OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION: *SAVING THE DAY*

Because of the negative social perception toward multicultural populations, they have suffered by discrimination; unpaid wages, human rights abuse, and domestic violence are some visible examples. As the size of the populations grew and these issues escalated into social conflicts, the majority of Koreans could no longer turn a blind eye to the problems, with many worrying about possible negative impacts on their own livelihood due to the multicultural people rather than concerns about their oppressive conditions.

Sympathetic Assimilationist Discourse

Given the increasing social awareness of growing multicultural populations in South Korea, the government was pressured to step in and present a response to the social problems. Relevant administrative departments, including the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Labor, the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family, and the Ministry of Education, quickly developed plans in order to alleviate social problems in relation to the multicultural population. The plans and policies, in turn, focused on maximizing social unification and minimizing social disorder. For example, the "Support for Multicultural Families Act," enforced in 2008 by the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family, stated its purpose as follow:

> *The purpose of this Act is to elevate the quality of life of the members of multicultural families and to contribute to social integration by ensuring that*

such members of multicultural families enjoy stable family life (The Ministry of Gender Equality and Family, 2008, p 1).

To that end, the act proposed comprehensive measures to solve and prevent social problems, such as the provision of living information and educational support, protection and support for victims of domestic violence, health care support for women before and after childbirth, and designation of multicultural family support centers. Yet, even with gradual increase in economic and social support given to migrants, the act reveals inherent social beliefs about multicultural populations which seem to keep other limitations in place. It seems to have been established on the assumption that multicultural populations pose a risk to society and need prompt intervention; simultaneously, the act itself has enhanced and promoted this rhetoric of peril. Moreover, the media outlets, such as TV programs, movies, documentaries, newspapers, public reports, etc., have played a part in creating a more negative or pitiful image of the multicultural populations. Immigrant wives have been mainly portrayed as individuals who struggle with the language barrier and who are the victims of sexual abuse, domestic violence, and discrimination. Likewise, migrant workers have often been described as cruel, deviant, or criminal-like. A sampling of some typical titles of articles found in major newspapers further expose this trend:

"Drugs, fraud… Watch out for foreigners' crime: A tenfold increase in the last 5 years" (April 23, 2009).
"A multicultural wife expelled from a sauna due to different skin color" (Oct. 13, 2011).
"Increasing divorce in multicultural families: 6 out of 10 couples in 5 years of marriage" (Nov. 3. 2011).
"All together, we are ONE! Helping multicultural families" (Nov. 11. 2011).
"15 Korean husbands of multicultural families were found to be conducting domestic violence" (Oct. 9, 2012).
"South Korea is becoming of refuge for foreign criminals" (April 28, 2013).

"Police sent a warning about sexual crimes to migrant workers at the opening of beach season" (June 6, 2013).
"Foreigners arrested for distributing capsules of human flesh nationwide" (Oct. 24, 2013).
"Rapid increase in foreigners' sexual crimes: twice the number as five years ago" (Nov. 4, 2013).
"Korean husband pushed Vietnamese wife for divorce after dumping his debt on her" (Jan. 9, 2014).

Overall, the articles highlight the dangers and struggles of multicultural people and construct only two possible kinds of images for them: pitiful or evil. The case for multicultural students is no exception; the media has also presented them with an emphasis on their poor condition **(**J-B Lee, 2008; Yang & Cheong, 2008), usually concluding with the necessity of instant intervention to make them become more like normal Koreans. Inevitably, the media contributes to forming a sympathetic assimilationist discourse, that Korean should *save the day* for non-Koreans, positioning the government and citizens of South Korea in a heroic, or superior role, rescuing them from their plight and teaching them how to be productive citizens.

Recently, the media has introduced positive examples of multicultural people, who have successfully settled down and happily set up housekeeping. However, the cases have still pointed out that the stable life depends on how the immigrant wives and workers actively embrace Korean lifestyles and values. Demonstrating these cases is no less than validation for the assimilationist discourse and emphasizes the need for any intervention to facilitate their assimilation. Therefore, the policies and plans related to the multicultural population in South Korea have generally been regarded as inevitable in order to save them from poverty and deficiency, to minimize current numerous social problems, and to prevent

any expected ones (Kang, 2012; Y-S Cheong, 2011). This has been the dominant discourse found in South Korea.

Out of this discursive context, the Ministry of Education initiated plans to guide multicultural education in 2006. Therefore, it is no wonder that the first plan for multicultural education, "Educational Support Plan for Children from Multicultural Families (The Ministry of Education, 2006), set out its purposes as maintaining social integration, protection of human rights, and prevention of educational alienation for multicultural students at a socioeconomic disadvantage. In the case of one school in this study, Pebble Elementary School, its rationale for implementing a multicultural education project was couched in similar language:

> *In order to enable these students to be equipped with refinement, which is necessary to lead an independent life as a member of Korean society (Pebble Elementary School, 2013, p 1).*

The statement negatively insinuates that, on their own, multicultural students lack the "refinement" and sophistication necessary to become productive South Korean citizens. It seems, then, that the assimilationist discourse evident in South Korean society at large has also governed multicultural education.

Anti-Multicultural Discourses

While the government has introduced abundant multicultural-friendly regulations and policies, South Koreans' contempt for multicultural people, non-white and low-class foreigners, have been more blatant and even anti-multicultural discourses have recently been rising and widespread (Yang & Kyeong, 2011). Specifically, this hostile voices have

been apparent on Internet spaces. If there is a supporting or sympathetic post about multicultural people on the Internet, most of the comments on the post are filled with statements of opposition outpacing those of support. Even several anti-multicultural websites, online communities, and organizations have been created, which explicitly express hostility against multicultural issues (Kang, 2012). Moreover, the anti-multicultural opinions have been recently found among academic articles published in peer-reviewed journals, which question and advocate against multicultural change (Y-M Kim, 2013).

This anti-multicultural state of South Korea originally roots in the delusion of racial, capital hierarchy as reviewed above; however, the underlying story has been concealed and other specious pretexts have been adopted to justify the position. These pretexts may be grouped into four main categories. First, the most often heard discourse has been constructed on the basis of capital stake. Since governmental multicultural policies have resulted in costly social programs, a thought has taken hold that multicultural people are squandering national tax revenues, which would/should be used for South Koreans. In fact, they are often perceived as welfare recipients (J-S Kim, 2011). Further, as the economic recession in South Korea has continued and the numbers of unemployed or low-income Koreans have been on the rise, a dispute over reverse discrimination has gotten more serious. For instance, a newspaper reported a protest complaining "why they steal our job and pockets" (Y-R Park, 2011). Although the discourse includes a wide spectrum of viewpoints, from never assisting non-Koreans to just reducing the amount of spending on them, it has deeply permeated South Korean society.

Another type of anti-multicultural discourse has been rather overtly based on the racial illusion. By insisting that South Korea has been historically a monoracial country, it identifies the foreigners as a threat to national identity. This discourse has enhanced the

sense of crisis in Korean society through using certain loaded words such as the "dissolution" and "extinction" of the Korean race. For example, from one of the anti-multicultural online communities, I was able to find that kind of postings by various members almost every week for six months, from February to July, 2014.[10] Although the people producing this discourse have also acknowledged that the Korean race had been constructed through a mixture of diverse bloodlines, they have still claimed that the race of mixed bloodlines has been kept stable since a certain time in its past, so Korea has been a single-race country. Thus, the discourse has asserted that Korea is a very unique and rare nation that consists of a homogenous racial majority and very small numbers of people of other races (Y-M Kim, 2013, p 149). They claim that this feature of Korea should be protected through governmental intervention, such as controlling the entry number of foreigners.

A third type of discourse, which asserts that multicultural society increases social conflicts and dangers, has also been prevalent. Exaggerating violence or highlighting crimes committed by migrant people has produced negative sentiments toward multicultural people among Koreans. This discourse has raised fears, not about Korean racial identity, but about social security. It has clearly appeared on the statement made public in May 2014 by an organization.[11] In addition, this racist voice has conversely employed concerns about racism. The anti-multiculturalists on this position have argued that racism had never been present in South Korean society before and that this society would eventually experience a civil war or a great disaster in the future due to racial conflicts (Kang, 2012). Social problems or racial incidents in other multiracial countries have been often adopted as examples to sustain this discourse. Advocates of this discourse

[10]Damoonhwa Jeongchack Bandea (Opposition to Multicultural Policies) http://cafe.daum.net/dacultureNO
[11]Namseung Yeondae (Men's Solidarity for Nation, Family, and Balance) http://www.manofkorea.com

have claimed that a single racial country guarantees better security than a multiracial society, and so such South Korean society should set policies to minimize the influx of a multicultural population.

Lastly, there has been opposition to the multicultural wave on the ground of criticism of Sadaejuui.[12] Even though the anti-multicultural stance is aligned with racial hierarchy, which indeed roots in a longing for Westernization, it seems unaware of the behind story. Rather, the discourse criticizes proponents of multiculturalism: they are uncritical about its effects and consequences because of their subservient desire to be like Western countries, especially those developed nations with multicultural societies (K-W Jeon, 2010). In other words, it has devalued them as admirers who blindly follow other Western countries. In addition, it has also distinguished the socio-historical context of South Korea from that of the West; for South Korea, multicultural society is not an inevitable destiny nor a reality that has already happened, but a societal choice that is perceived as controllable. Therefore, this discourse has urged autonomous decision-making on multicultural social change, upon cool-headed review and social agreement.

These four discourses have each produced different viewpoints, but simultaneously they have argued for a similar end: the current multicultural wave in South Korea should be stopped. Interestingly, this conclusion has also been justified with the need to *save the day*; yet, not for non-Koreans this time, but for Koreans and South Korean society. Since these four discourses have been empowered with their persuasive reasoning and several evidential instances, the anti-multicultural discourses have come to earn a conspicuous place in the social debate (J-S Kim, 2011).

[12]Sadaejuui, extremely contrasting to nationalism, is a term naming an attitude that admires and submits to other larger, powerful countries. The term was used since early 20th century by nationalists in order to give an account of the less prosperity of Korea at that time (Michell, 2008).

In response to these anti-multicultural discourses, the Ministry of Education declared a slightly modified trajectory for multicultural education. It considered developing multicultural students as human resources, who would contribute to society instead of requiring abundant aids, as indicated in the Ministry's 2012 plan:

> *So far, multicultural students have been understood as an alienated and disadvantaged group, so they were recognized as the target only to support. However, this plan tried to initiate a change in perception of them as valuable human resources through developing their aptitude and talent. At the same time, the plan would contribute multicultural education, which is about understanding of diversity and respect of difference, to become a part of the educational curriculum not only for multicultural students, but also for all students (The Ministry of Education, 2012a, p 6).*

Even though the plan's ostensible focus was on recognizing multicultural students' strength and expanding the educational scope to non-multicultural students, the detailed strategies and policies have still been limited to multicultural students and numerous aids for their basic achievement and adjustment, as the previous plans. Therefore, a gap has widened between assistance policies in school and anti-multicultural perspectives among school members.

ASSISTANCE POLICES FOR MULTICULTURAL STUDENTS: *IT'S NONE OF YOUR BUSINESS*

After the 2006 plan, the Ministry of Education published updates to multicultural education each year up 2012; it also published a plan for North Korean refugee students in 2014. Under the sympathetic assimilationist stream of governmental interventions, a great deal of aid for multicultural students has been carried out according to the plans in order to contribute to their adjustment in South Korean schooling. To implement the supporting

policies, the Ministry of Education has increased the budget for multicultural education to 10 times what it was five years ago, compared to the only 2.3-fold increase in multicultural students in the same period (The Ministry of Education, 2013). Among the various aids, language learning assistance and the mentorship program are the most representative forms of support.

Aids for Language Learning

When the Ministry of Education announced the guidelines for multicultural students in the plans, it commented on the necessity of its proposed supports and aids. The most commonly mentioned reason was the lack of the students' language fluency. The plans described multicultural students as experiencing a hard time in school due to the language barrier. For example, the ministry evaluated multicultural students as experiencing "delayed language development" and a "language gap" (The Ministry of Education, 2009, p 2), or as being "poor at the Korean language" (The Ministry of Education, 2012, p 3) in the plans. Under this reasoning, poor Korean language ability was understood as the most distinct characteristic of multicultural students. Furthermore, fluency in the Korean language came to be a criterion to discern a multicultural student's adaptation to school.

Language learning assistance has been practiced in two dimensions: one is for multicultural students who are unable to speak Korean well, another for multicultural students who are familiar with Korean. The first group generally indicates the students who migrated at school age or are children of two foreign parents. The children who were born in South Korea as children of binational marriage families belong to the second group. Given the categorization, multicultural education plans have required a preparatory class

or a special class for the first group; and for the second group, the system of bilingual teachers has been adopted.

Preparatory classes have offered intensive lessons on language and culture. The class is not a requirement but an elective for multicultural students who belong to the first group. It aims to assist the students to be ready to enter an ordinary public school. The students can attend a regular school after completing the six-month preparatory class. More than 37 preparatory classes were operating in 15 regions as of 2014. Besides the preparatory classes operated at the regional level, special classes for multicultural students have been operating at each school level as needed. While multicultural students belong to regular classes, they also attend the special classrooms for specific lessons in, for example, KSL (Korean as a Second Language) and Korean culture as well as the motherland's language. Twenty-six special classrooms in the entire nation had been established by 2013.

In the case of the D Regional Office of Education, with which the three schools in this study were affiliated, it additionally has provided individual assistance for multicultural students who have difficulty in the Korean language. If there is a request from a school for a student from this first group who is struggling to understand a teacher's instruction, the office appoints a translator-helper for the student. Only a total of 15 multicultural students in the city received this service in 2013 (Daegu Office of Education, 2014). This relatively small number of multicultural students was explained by the fact that most multicultural students belong to the second group. In fact, the vast majority of multicultural students – for example, 87.9% in 2011 – were children having a Korean parent in binational families (The Ministry of Education, 2012). Yet, the categorization sometimes results in the service's ineffectiveness. For instance, the case of a North Korean refugee student at Pebble Elementary School who came to South Korea a year and half ago and who was struggling in the South Korean dialect due to significantly different

vocabularies shows how. The student was not eligible to get the individual helper because she having a North Korean background was excluded from both groups.

Meanwhile, in terms of language learning for multicultural students, introduction of bilingual teachers is the most commonly found aid in school. About 298 schools across the nation already operated a bilingual teacher system in 2012, and the Ministry of Education aims to expand to 1,254 schools by 2015 (The Ministry of Education, 2012, p 4). These teachers are supposed to work for the second group of multicultural students who are used to the Korean language. The main duty of bilingual teachers is teaching Korean to them after school, particularly academic Korean rather than conversational. Yet, because bilingual teachers usually regard the multicultural students as being fluent in Korean, they work mostly on academic achievement and instruct the students in underachieving subjects. The D Regional Office of Education hired 200 bilingual teachers from 2011 to 2013 for schools having more than six multicultural students on campus. Two of the three schools in this study had one bilingual teacher each, and both teachers worked on multicultural students' academic learning rather than language study. Besides language instruction, bilingual teachers have been requested to care for multicultural students in terms of their social conditions and psychological counseling.

Interestingly, due to the bilingual teachers' close relationship to and comprehensive work with multicultural students, teachers seem to simply consider any issue related to their multicultural students not as their responsibility but the responsibility of bilingual teachers. In fact, bilingual teachers also point out their hardship as rare cooperation with homeroom teachers (Chang, 2011). The degree of teacher Seong's relationship with the bilingual teacher at her school might be a typical example:

> *In the case of Bo-Mi, I don't know when she goes to the bilingual classroom and how she is doing there. It is not my required duty to send her to the classroom. Bo-Mi should talk to the teacher and then go. If I get a note sometimes from the bilingual teacher, I just say "Bo-Mi, you know the bilingual classroom, don't you? Go there." Actually I do not know who is the bilingual teacher in this school. I don't know the teacher's face. Once the teacher came to my classroom, but I don't remember. Unawareness is not only my case, but all other teachers might be the same. (Seong, 3rd interview)*

This example suggests that the system of bilingual teachers, which was originally proposed to support multicultural students, can have a contrary result in increasing indifference among teachers. In other words, teachers have the impression that multicultural students have their own special teacher who is in charge of them, so caring for multicultural students and engaging with bilingual teachers is not their responsibility; *it's none of their business*. In the case of Sae-Ra, who had no bilingual teacher assigned to the school due to the low number of multicultural students present, a more active attitude toward the affairs of multicultural students was shown, even if she complained this task to be "annoying" (Sae-Ra, 2nd interview).

Aids through Mentorship Program

Besides the language issue, evaluations have identified underachievement as another dominant trend among multicultural students. Following the diagnosis that these students perform poorly at basic standards, another noticeable policy, which had not been previously implemented in schools, was proposed as treatment—namely, mentorship. Any multicultural students, if they apply for the program, can receive one-on-one mentorship from a local college student. For the multicultural students residing in rural areas, online

mentorship program has been provided. This mentorship program aims to raise the students' achievement to the basic standard, but also includes counseling about the students' living and participating in outdoor cultural activities.

To take the example of the D Regional Office of Education, applications were received during May and 400 to 500 multicultural student-mentees were matched with an individual mentor in 2013. The mentors were hired from among a wide pool of applicants, who were students of four-year universities in the city. The affiliated universities of mentors provided a certain amount of monetary reward as well as acknowledging mentorship as a volunteer activity.[13] The mentorship program ran for 120 hours from June to February.[14] The office recommended having meetings twice a week for two hours each at the mentee-student's school.

If the tendency has been for bilingual teachers to unintentionally bring about homeroom teachers' carelessness toward multicultural students in general, college student-mentors seems to reinforce teachers' indifference specifically to the multicultural students' academic achievement. Teacher Sae-Ra placed responsibility for her multicultural student's achievement on the student's mentor. This allowed Sae-Ra to deflect any role she might have had in this process as the student's primary classroom instructor (4th interview). A non-homeroom bilingual teacher, Yoo-Jeong, was also conscious of the indifference of homeroom teachers:

> *In fact, it seems that there is no extra attention given to multicultural students because there are other resources, such as me, a bilingual teacher. For*

[13]Teacher Seong also worked as a mentor in a college. She described the program as follows: "*When I was a student at a college, we had to fill certain hours of voluntary service. It was a requirement for graduation. Most of my friends and I did so as mentors. We tutored students and participated in cultural activities with them. In addition, you could earn some money from the work. It was killing two birds with one stone. It was very popular*" (Seong, 1st interview).

[14]The academic year is from March to February.

example, Hyo-Sun has an individual translator-helper and a mentor. There are many resources. So, her homeroom teacher seems less concerned about her (Yoo-Jeong, 3rd interview).

I heard a very similar opinion in a casual dialogue with a bilingual teacher at Sprout Elementary School as well. Based on these responses, I couldn't deny that the educational supports and aids often led teachers to become nonchalant about multicultural education. A key theme here reflects the statement: *it's none of your business*. Ironically, as programs have become more widely implemented, they seem to provide reinforcement for certain teachers to deflect responsibility toward multicultural students, even while not explicitly embracing this outcome.

In addition to the resources above, some multicultural students who belong to a low-income bracket have received free lunch and vouchers for afterschool programs. These benefits actually apply to any students whose family meets the condition regardless of their multicultural background. However, there is a general belief that multicultural students are the primary recipients of this welfare benefit, because of the fact that there are many recipients among them. Unfortunately, perhaps this impression has also been adopted to justify teachers' lack of concern for these students.

Moreover, the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family has provided aid to the community at large that extends and supplements the Ministry of Education's in-school programs. One of the main works of this ministry benefits multicultural families and immigrant wives. Thus, their children have also been a recipient of the ministry's service. The ministry has offered more intensive and advanced services than the ones provided in the education sector. It has operated community centers for multicultural families in various neighborhoods; these centers have provided Korean language education and evaluation, mother tongue instruction, counseling, and cultural activities. The supports

offered outside of the school context, which teachers might perceive as too many, may also play a part in generating teachers' indifference regarding multicultural students and multicultural education.

MULTICULTURAL CURRICULUM: *THAT'S ABOUT IT*

When concerns about multicultural education were aroused in 2006, the national curriculum and textbooks were also brought to attention. Just in time, a revised national curriculum [15] was released in 2007 to replace the previous one published in 1997. Therefore, for the first time, this 2007 curriculum included the topic of multicultural education as one of the cross-curricular learning topics, along with another 17 new topics in addition to the 16 existing ones.[16] In addition, to reflect the social change, expressions that had highlighted a single Korean ethnicity, such as "value Korean ethnic identity" and "contribute to Korean ethnic culture," were removed from the curriculum. Further, several subject curricula, including Social Studies, Moral Education, Music, and Art, expanded their aims and scope to address non-Koreans in society and their diverse cultures. However, the 2007 curriculum did not include detailed content and guidelines for multicultural education (Lee & Song, 2011; Seol, 2012). For instance, the 2007 curriculum of elementary school directly mentioned the word "multicultural" only three times in the introduction, but no more in subjects' description throughout almost 300 pages (The Ministry of Education, 2007).

[15]This 2007 curriculum has been applied in elementary schools since 2009 and will be terminated in February 2015. Do-Jin, a music teacher for the 3rd to 5th grades, and Seong, a 3rd grade teacher, were implementing this 2007 curriculum when I conducted this study in 2013.

[16]For example, these topics included education on patriotism, Korean unification, Korean cultural identity, global culture, the environmental, safety, sex, gender equity, human rights, incorruptibility, etc.

The feeble change in the 2007 curriculum was stepped up in 2009. In that year, the Ministry of Education amended the 2007 curriculum and newly published another version of the national curriculum. The 2009 curriculum has been implemented in the primary grades[17] since 2013. This newest national curriculum more actively includes multicultural education compared to the previous one. Every subject except Math directly indicates multicultural knowledge or attitude as a part of standards or goals on the documents (The Ministry of Education, 2009). Moreover, the 2009 curriculum developed Korean as a Second Language (KSL) in the form of an official regular curriculum for the special class of multicultural students.

Indoctrination of Tolerance

Multicultural aspects in both the 2007 and 2009 national curricula correspond to the major discourse in society, the sympathetic assimilationist discourse. They identify multicultural people as deficient or struggling, differentiating them from the Korean majority. The curricula imposes the virtue of tolerance toward these others on Korean students with an emphasis on "understanding," "considering," and "embracing" them. Below are some examples that show this perspective:

- *Standards of Social Studies in 2007 curriculum*
  -Diverse life styles – (f) Have understanding and embracing attitude toward different cultures (3rd grade, p 114)
  -Social Change and Life – (f) Understand various lifestyles and understand right of social minority and disadvantaged people and its importance (4th grade, p 118)
- *Standards of The Integrated Subjects in 2009 curriculum, (1st and 2nd grade)*

[17]Sae-Ra, a 2nd grade teacher in 2013, taught this curriculum.

-Know the appropriate attitude toward foreigners (Disciplined Life, p 9)
-Recognize that we live in harmony with multicultural families (Intelligent Life, p 21)

- *Evaluation Guidelines of The Integrated Subjects in 2009 curriculum, (1st and 2nd grade)*
  - Focus students' understanding and consideration for variety of families and cultures (Disciplined Life, p 13)
  - Value a considerate and inclusive attitude toward diverse families and their members (Intelligent Life, p 27)
  - Focus on an inclusive attitude toward multicultural families as ordinary (Pleasant Life, p 42)

This curricular approach has been more emphasized and concretely realized in the national textbooks. When multicultural people appear in textbooks, their difficulties are mostly highlighted in the form of inherent, static, and common problems. For example, in Social Studies textbooks developed according to the 2007 curriculum, a multicultural student is bullied because of his black skin color (3rd grade) and another multicultural student is introduced as a child of unregistered workers who experiences danger and anxiety (4th grade). The single presentation without any other cases or further explanation sounds like a representative story of every multicultural student. Another example clearly shows this emphasis on otherness in a 2nd grade textbook for Integrated Subjects. It is the unit of 'Diverse Families' developed over 20 lessons according to the 2009 curriculum. The stated aim of this unit is to investigate diverse family types and their cultures, which are different from a student's own, and develop considerate attitudes toward various family members. However, the unit does not present a two-Korean-parent family as one of the various family types. Instead, it mainly covers a multicultural family type along with the single-parent family and grandparent family types.

In addition, after the unit highlights the problematic status of these families, it suggests solutions that stimulate their assimilation and adjustment to Korean society: teaching Korean culture, such as Korean traditional dress, formal greetings, and language. This juxtaposition of multicultural students in the textbook reveals the sense of Korean superiority and normalized belief in Korean culture. Moreover, when the unit deals with the ways to help them, it is disseminating the concept of multicultural students' unequal status. The students from the 'normal' two-Korean-parent family are positioned as providers for others' troubles and the students from 'abnormal' families like a multicultural family as passive receivers (Kim, S-Y, 2013). This approach is also found from the lessons of Social Studies above; the two lessons end with the moral of having tolerance for others who are less fortunate than 'normal Koreans.'

Therefore, actual multicultural education in the classroom can be slightly overlooked after teachers' didactic speech to embrace them. Moreover, it is hard to find a place in these textbooks to pull out the account of social structure or power relations deeply buried under the issues the multicultural population is struggling. Consequently, the theme of social justice and equity is scarcely ever covered even outwardly (Chang & Jeon, 2013). Hence, this curricular organization seems to construct a finite concept of multicultural education as indoctrination of moral dispensation and little else: *that's about it*.

Superficial Cultural Information

Besides moral lessons, the other multicultural portion of the 2007 and 2009 curricula takes the form of cultural informative content. Partially inserted or expanded sections that reflect the multicultural aspect are mostly about various countries' songs,

food, housing, clothing, language, etc. (H-D Kim, 2010). For example, some newly added items for multicultural education in the two curricula are below:

- *2007 curriculum*

-Foreign Holidays (Social Studies, 3rd grade)
-World geography and other various cultures (Social Studies, 6th grade)
-Art works by/from diverse genders, races, ethnicities, areas, epochs, and styles for an appreciation activity (Art)
-Foreign Songs: Asian songs for 3rd grade, European songs for 4th grade, American songs for 5th grade, and African songs for 6th grade (Music)

- *2009 curriculum*

-Foreign countries' cultures (song, dance, festivals) (Social Studies, 3rd and 4th grade)
-Investigate other countries and be interested (Intelligent Life)
-Make various expressions with diverse families' cultures (Pleasant Life)
-Introducing cultures of other countries (Pleasant Life)

As these curricular materials and standards have been developed into textbooks, the cultural elements have become more exaggerated. For example, the unit on 'Diverse Families' allots more than half of the total 20 lessons to sampling various cultural elements. Further, at the end of the unit, a multicultural festival is presented as the summing-up activity; the textbook suggests four cultural activities related to clothes, food, household items, and languages.

The music textbook is another example of this sampling approach. According to the 2007 music curriculum, the national music textbook added several children's songs from other countries for the singing activity. For instance, a 3rd-grade textbook includes four children songs of China, the Philippines, Japan, and Israel with the lyrics in both languages, a Korean translation and a transliteration of the original language into Korean

characters. Along with the music notes, the textbook suggests several activities related to these songs.

> *・Sing each song as highlighting the country's characteristics*
> *・Sing in both languages*
> *・Play a traditional game of the country while singing the song*
> *・Reflect on the meaning of the lyrics*
> *・Understand Asian lifestyle and culture through the songs*
> *・Listen to children's songs from other Asian countries such as Mongolia, Indonesia, and Turkey (3rd grade Music Textbook, p 46-48)*

It seems the textbook intends an abundance of cultural learning with this inclusion of foreign songs. However, self-contradictorily, it allots only two lessons to these four songs, unlike the typical two or three lessons for one Korean song. This is not even enough time to sound out the lyrics in the original language. Thus, teaching these lessons has actually resulted in "almost learning other languages." (Do-Jin, 3rd interview) That is, the lessons, which were added for multicultural education, ultimately induce a superficial taste of foreign culture without providing opportunities to expand students' cultural understanding or sensitivity.

As curricula and textbooks have been developed this way, the concept of multicultural education seems to be confined to foreign culture education, which superficially tours foreign cultural elements; *that's about it*. This kind of concept is also reinforced by bilingual teachers' lessons. In a school having a bilingual teacher, each class usually gets one or two lessons each year from the bilingual teacher. The lessons, referred to as 'the multicultural lesson,' are also all about cultural elements. For instance, a bilingual teacher in Sprout Elementary School taught a lesson about various styles of houses in

foreign countries and Chinese paper cutting crafts for 3rd graders in 2013. Yoo-Jeong, a bilingual teacher in Pebble Elementary School, also taught Chinese paper cutting crafts, Chinese facial painting, and Chinese traditional dress for three years in a row to every class.

Insignificant Education

Lastly, a distinctive feature of multicultural curricula is the sparse treatment of the two themes mentioned above. In the case of the didactic multicultural lessons for tolerant attitudes, the national curricula only devoted a small amount of time, about one or two lessons a year. Otherwise, that kind of content was marginally dealt with as supplementary, which is more apt to be neglected and passed over for more "practical" lessons. For example, teacher Seong did not even know there was a story about a multicultural family in the supplementary textbook, until after she taught the unit, saying, "multicultural content hasn't shown up yet. I didn't notice anything in the textbooks" (Seong, 3rd interview). Regretfully or not, cultural touring lessons also occur seldomly. In addition to a few subjects' lessons, the "multicultural lesson" taught by a bilingual teacher is held just one or two times a year and a "multicultural education week" also takes place once in May.[18] Except for these specific occasions, multicultural education seldom appears in school. Moreover, this one-time event education is similarly found at exemplary schools or research schools of multicultural education (Chang, 2011; Shim, 2013). Thus, teachers perceive multicultural education as one only to teach at those occasions, but not usually (Kyun et al, 2012); *that's about it*. For that impression, it can be difficult to expect teachers

[18]In celebration of the Day of Global Citizens on May 20th, most elementary schools acknowledge the multicultural education week. During the week, schools provide extra foreign cultural experience or related lectures one or two times.

to make an effort to get involve multicultural education more actively beyond the given events.

> *So far, I have never mentioned multicultural stuff. The multicultural education week, that event was all. No other time (Seong, 3rd interview).*

Moreover, even the planned multicultural education seems not to take place at times. According to the 2007 and 2009 curricula, schools should try to teach multicultural lessons in all subject-lessons during an academic year because multicultural education is one of the cross-curricular learning topics. In addition, the D Regional Office of Education established a rule to devote at least two hours to multicultural education a year. However, it looks like actual multicultural education has resulted in empty formalities. It is found in a case of Pebble Elementary School, which purported to have these mandatory lessons, but in actuality, did not.

> *It is just a formality. Last year, we should have two lesson times, but who really taught it? Frankly, we only marked it in the lesson plans. That's all (Do-Jin, 2nd interview).*

Accordingly, this occasional and unsubstantial practice of multicultural education presents it as mere break in the middle of academic study rather than as essential material students need to learn. This signifies to teachers that multicultural education itself is insignificant and unimportant, or *that's about it*. While the educational policy has kept spreading indifference to multicultural education among teachers, it seems that the perfunctory curriculum has also failed to attract teachers' attention.

MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION FOR TEACHERS: *THAT'S AWFUL*

In accordance with the 2009 plan of the Ministry of Education, multicultural education has notably been incorporated into teacher education, both for pre-service and in-service teachers. This multicultural teacher education has also been deeply embedded in the framework of multicultural education, which is reviewed in this chapter. In other words, teacher training for multicultural education has been a means to transmit assimilation and cultural factual knowledge (Mo, 2009; Hur et al., 2010; Na, 2011). Furthermore, teacher education itself has also created a negative stereotype about multicultural students. This section illustrates the practical features of teacher education through the experiences of the participant-teachers.

Pre-service Teacher Trainings

Since 2009, in response to the ministry's plan, the colleges of education have introduced classes on multicultural education and operated the mentoring program to facilitate pre-service teachers' familiarity with multicultural students. Each college usually opens one course for freshmen and the course, according to the Ministry's exemplary syllabus, which covers introductory theories or multicultural phenomena (Park & Park, 2010). Because of its short history, there are few research projects on pre-service teacher multicultural education (Woo, 2010); yet, the existing studies, according to a quantitative survey, commonly concluded its findings based on the students' self-report as follows: the courses positively influence pre-service teachers' multicultural understanding in terms of earning useful knowledge and experience, increasing awareness and sensitivity about multicultural issue as serious', etc. (Auh & Jung, 2011; Park & Park, 2010). However, these studies do not explain what kind of knowledge they gained or if and how their perception was changed after taking the courses. The details of the education's effect on

pre-service teachers might be inferred from what topics and contents have been taught in the courses. In this regard, Seong's experience can be viewed as an actual case.

Seong, the youngest teacher, was the only one who had had pre-service teacher multicultural education among the participant-teachers because she most recently entered a college of education in 2009. In particular, the college of education from which Seong graduated opened a Multicultural Educational Center on the campus in March 2009. She recalled her educational experience as follows:

> *I'm not sure there was a specific class for multicultural education in my college, but I remember one course covered the topic over several weeks. And it appeared on the mid-term and final. I had to answer the question of what* ***problems*** *or* ***difficulties*** *multicultural students have and how do teachers teach multicultural education well. And there were several special lectures by guest speakers about multicultural education, which were required for every student. And there was one professor who was very interested in the topic, so he gave many lectures about it (Seong, 1st interview).*

From Seong's comment, it can be surmised that her program emphasized the hardships of multicultural students. Yet, this does not seem unusual. A 16 week-course at a college in a different region allotted three lessons only for the theme of "actual condition and problems" of multicultural families (Auh & Jung, 2011, p 70). However, it did not challenge pre-service teachers' mindset nor did it expand their sociocultural understanding. There was little room for a critical perspective on social systems or relations, in which these problems are grounded; rather, it mostly attended to the tangible phenomena. Therefore, the new knowledge and concept pre-service teachers learn from courses might align with the "deficit thinking" (Valencia, 1997) and stereotypes about multicultural students that are embedded in the social discourse and ministry policy; *that's awful*.

Furthermore, teacher education seems to pass a functionalist perspective on to pre-service teachers, which views multicultural population as something to utilize for the advancement of South Korean society. Teacher Seong's experience offers a glimpse of that aspect in teacher multicultural education.

> *The professor told us that we should reach to the level of utilizing multicultural people for society beyond helping and supporting them. In several years, they would significantly account for the total population. So, for example, in the lesson, he told that we can use the student as an informant about other cultures (Seong, 2nd interview).*

A poster, introduced in her college lesson as exemplary material (1st interview), also indicates how this functionalist perspective is uncritically accepted in teacher education. It was a public service announcement about skin color which first appeared in 2001.[19] The poster presented three color crayons, white, black, and peach, and said that "all of these are skin colors. Migrant workers are also precious humans who have different skin colors. They are valuable visitors who will report about our nation after going back" (Korea Broadcast Advertising Corp., 2001). Although it challenged preconceptions about skin color and claimed human dignity for foreigners, eventually the logical basis for their "value" was grounded in the possible social interest of South Korea, such as the improvement of national image. The foreigners' value was explained by "our" benefit gained by them.

In addition, it seems teacher education for bilingual teachers in some ways is not critically delivered either. Bilingual teachers are recruited from legal immigrant wives who

[19]A picture of the poster is in Appendix D.

complete certain training courses and meet a certain level of education[20]. The training courses, which equip immigrant wives as bilingual teachers, consist of theoretical lectures by professors, instructional methodological lectures by in-service teachers, and a practicum. According to Yoo-Jeong, a bilingual teacher in this study, the attendees in the training for bilingual teachers had not been exposed to critical understanding. Rather, Yoo-Jeong recalled that what she heard most frequently from the lecture concerned students' safety; "in order to avoid any accidents, we were cautioned not to take students out of the classroom for any reason" (Yoo-Jeong, 3rd interview).

In-service Teacher Trainings

For in-service teachers, multicultural trainings have often been implemented during vacation periods. The National Center for Multicultural Education, established in 2008 in order to develop policies and projects related to multicultural education, has offered training courses to teachers, especially those who manage multicultural education in schools. In addition, regional offices of education have also offered several training courses. One or two teachers from each school take the course for 30 or 60 hours during each vacation period. Three of the teachers, Sae-Ra, Do-Jin, and Seong, had not taken a training course related to multicultural education yet. However, Sae-Ra, who was hired in 2009, and Seong, hired in 2013, reported that they heard a lecture during a training session for new employees.

Multicultural in-service teacher education is also practiced at the individual school level. Schools are required to hold a multicultural education training one or two times a

[20]The criteria are various upon each province and region. In the case of D office of education, legal immigrant wives who have a bachelor's degree, are done with 120 hour-training, and fluent in Korean (or have a score on a Korean language test) were eligible to apply for the position.

year, and to report it to the office of education. The three schools in this study had this training as well. Yet, according to Sae-Ra's description, it seems that Valley Elementary School only perfunctorily offered a training.

> *This school usually has one or twice a year. Actually today, we had a training. It was simple. On the document, the training was scheduled for an hour, but it was done in 10 minutes when we gathered for a weekly teachers' meeting. Today it was about… um… It was about how the curriculum covers multicultural education and the problems of current school curriculum. These were very quickly mentioned. Very superficially. The director of the students' welfare department gave a short instruction after she passed out a handout (Sea-Ra, 1st interview).*

In contrast to the training done as a formality at Valley Elementary, Sprout Elementary School, where Do-Jin and Seong were employed, held an actual training. The school invited a guest speaker in the afternoon to give a talk from a local multicultural center run by the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family. Yet, the message teachers heard from the training seemed to inadvertently reinforce negative stereotypes of multicultural people.

- *A few days ago, there was a training. In the lecture, he told us a story of a mother from Vietnam. Even though her child can't read, she doesn't care, saying, "it is fine. I was the same when I was young." Like this way. And he explained why the immigrant women came here. There are two groups. First, to earn money. This group of women does whatever it takes to earn money. They are scary because they prioritize money over even their husbands. It is because they think if they sacrifice, their family in the home country will live well. The second group is women who are immature, so they simply expect the lifestyle that they've seen on Korean soap operas. … (Do-Jin told another immigrant woman's story heard from the training)… Wow,*

their thoughts are totally different from mine. Their way of thinking is like that, so I again realized that humans are so different (Do-Jin, 2nd interview).

- *On Tuesday, we had a training. The training was fun because the speaker gave so many real stories. It was unbelievable. The condition of multicultural families is really more serious than I've thought. It is very awful. What should we do in the future if the multicultural mothers and the students increase in number? I have come to worry about it (Seong, 2nd interview).*

The training that was originally planned to foster teachers' multicultural understanding eventually resulted in creating feelings of disdain toward multicultural people: *that's awful*. It seems that this reaction occurred because the lecture was not accompanied by opportunities to critically reflect. Therefore, the cultural difference and the hardship of multicultural families, which the training underlined in order to encourage teachers' concern and caring for multicultural students, could not help but propagate teachers' deficit thinking about them.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter looked into the world of multicultural society and education in South Korea. First, I situated its class and racial structures, and multicultural change within a particular historical and sociocultural context as well as the global situation. Through unpacking the hierarchical belief or illusion, I could get to the root of negative multicultural understanding of South Koreans. Then, I identified four distinct multicultural discourses to which teachers are exposed in this world. These shared notions were the four 'walls' constructing up the framework for teachers on multicultural education and multicultural students. Because this discursive framework was mostly related to the practices of the

Ministry of Education, it seemed to hold sway as a dominant and appropriate multicultural concept.

First, the world of multicultural education, notably the sphere of teacher education, has influenced stereotypes about multicultural people among teachers. They were characterized as individuals situated in very terrible circumstances and experiencing serious problems. Further, the situation was usually explained by deficit thinking and stereotypes about them. This image aroused antagonism toward multicultural people, but simultaneous agreement with their need for governmental assistance. Therefore, secondly, the world prescribed multicultural education as charitable aid as if it could be a solution for the multicultural students. The ministry initiated multicultural education using the sympathetic assimilationist discourse toward multicultural students, while anti-multicultural discourses were simultaneously coexisting and gaining grounds in school. Within that broad direction of multicultural education, the Ministry of Education offered various assistance policies for multicultural students. On the other hand, the world of multicultural education also promoted a very contradictory attitude toward multicultural students although it may not have intended this effect. There was an overflowing perception that multicultural students have too much support. Moreover, as the innovative system of bilingual teachers and mentors was introduced, there was a notion that teachers do not need to care for multicultural students in spite of the fact that the helpers were partially in charge of multicultural students' education. The atmosphere provided room to justify teachers' disinterest toward multicultural students, and teachers came to alienate themselves from these multicultural others. Lastly, the world constructed the frame with a very narrow definition of multicultural education. Since 2007, there were apparent changes in the national curriculum to meet the request for multicultural education. Yet, the curriculum, within an essentialist or assimilationist approach, touched lightly upon

superficial cultural elements, similar to taste or tour of other cultures; otherwise, it consisted of a few moral lessons, which infused the value of Korean norms through segregation and assimilation. Therefore, the curriculum, adopting an additive approach within the existing structure, exhibited its benevolence by allocating some portion to multicultural education, but, below the surface, it further validated teachers' simplistic understanding of multicultural education. In other words, it seems that the curriculum itself blocked an extension of teachers' thinking to critical and transformative teaching; it was the multicultural curriculum that held multicultural education back within a limited boundary.

This chapter comprehensively showed the multicultural discursive frame into which teachers enter. It portrayed global context, the broad Korean society, and the more localized contexts of each school regarding to the multicultural policy, national multicultural curriculum, and multicultural teacher education. This picture provides a backdrop for the following chapters, which will spotlight sociocultural understandings of the individual participant-teachers.

Chapter 5

Figures: Their Sociocultural Understandings

This chapter introduces the four participant-teachers of this study: Sae-Ra, Do-Jin, Seong, and Yoo-Jeong. It provides a sketch of each individual, including who they were, how they understood themselves, and how they made sense of sociocultural relations. Thus, the comprehensive introduction of their understandings provided in this chapter presents the four teachers' sociocultural identities to readers. This chapter is divided into four sections and each section, devoted to one participant-teacher, consists of two parts. Presenting the participants' life history at the beginning of each chapter provides a sense of the teacher's overall sociocultural background throughout their lifetime. Yet, the history does not give only personal background, but told in her/his own voice and through own narrative reveals how she/he understood him- or herself as well. That is, the first-person narratives, which I arranged in chronological order, reflect the narrators' self-images. In order to most clearly reveal the distinctive aspect of each teacher, I highlight a specific period in their life, for example, their school years or early career, dependent on the individual teacher. The life histories were heard mainly at the first interview but also supplemented from the other three interviews. Secondly, I illuminate their understanding of others and social relations. Throughout the four interviews, as responding to my questions or continuing their talk, they revealed their concepts, opinions, and thoughts about race, class, social systems, multicultural people, etc. I reorganized the words according to themes while I tried to let the ideas be connected for each teacher. This part can be read in relation to the self-understandings drawn from the participants in relation to

their life histories. At the end of this chapter, I present the summary of their sociocultural identities in a table.

SAE-RA

- *Hi, Seon-Young. There is no multicultural student in my classroom, but there is one in 2nd grade. I will ask the teacher. (message received on May 4th 2013 from Sae-Ra's colleague)*
- *She gladly agreed to participate in your study. (message received two days later from the teacher above)*

Sae-Ra, a homeroom teacher of 2nd grade at Valley Elementary School, came to be involved in this study as she immediately accepted a suggestion to participate from her colleague, with whom she had a close relationship in the school. Although the fellow teacher only briefly sketched out the participation requirements, comprising four interviews and six classroom observations, Sae-Ra agreed right away without understanding the study's purpose or having any other information. From the first meeting, her demeanor was friendly and she spoke with frankness. I easily noticed that Sae-Ra was a sociable and amiable woman. Behind her sweetness, at first sight, I also sensed her self-confidence – not only through her decision to participate without any hesitation in a study that involved many classroom observations (which teachers often dislike), but also through her dialogue and attitude. Her life history was consistent with my first impressions of her.

Life History

I, 28 years old, was born to a mother who was an elementary school teacher and a father who was a bank clerk. I think my family has belonged to the upper-middle class rather than the middle class because I never have had any concerns about money, so I

don't even know how to be thrifty. I think I grew up under good parents without any problems.

I went to the same elementary school where my mother worked, and I served as a class president every year during my whole five years in the school. For the record, my mother of course cared about me deeply in both visible and invisible ways. Yet, that was not all of it; I was also very careful and behaved well by myself because of my position as a daughter of a teacher. I think the fact that proved my efforts was that I kept the class president position till 11th grade, long beyond elementary school. During my school life, I enjoyed my leadership and attention from others. Keeping the position for so long was not easy, so I am very proud of this record. Actually, there was not a lot of support from my mom for my studies. Because my mom was working, she was not able to care for me a lot. My mom let me prepare next lesson, but she did not tutor me in person. Rather, she let me get in a room and do my work alone. She did not pay additional attention to me even during a test period. In 6th grade, there was a Korean-Chinese student in my classroom. She was always dirty, so I didn't like her and treated her meanly. She spoke Korean like Koreans, but her name was strange and sounded different. At that time, I didn't think she was "multicultural," but only that she was dirty. Now, I recognize her as a multicultural student and the only one I encountered during my school years.

I entered a private high school[21], to which only the top 3% of students in a middle school could go. Yet, I was not able to catch up there, so my test scores were just about at the average. The other students were so brilliant, and they seemed innately intelligent, people with whom I couldn't compete. There was a gap in ability between us. Yet, it was okay because I knew that if I went to another, more typical school, I would be at the top.

[21]In March 2002, it was one of three high schools in the nation that were designated for academic excellence. The school's tuition was three times the amount of public school tuition.

Due to that school's excellence, I was below some of my peers; this way of thinking comforted me a lot. Still, I am so proud of my high school. In 10th grade, I was bullied by several of my peers. It was too shocking because I had always been popular among my peers, so I cried a lot. After I realized my unusual behaviors caused this bullying, for example, trying to overly take center stage or present something in an impressive way; I tried not to stand out any more. From the experience, I've sympathized with bullied students, but at the same time, I've also thought that there was a certain problem in the student that causes them to be bullied. Another memory in high school was my test score in Korean History. I did really poorly in the subject, so one day I decided to immerse myself in it completely. Over one or two months, I really studied hard; after that time, I always got a perfect score. The experience makes me think that I could do anything if I do my best.

I always hoped to be a teacher (probably because of the influence of my mother), so I entered a college of elementary education. I majored in English because my mother told me the major would be an up-and-coming area of study in schools. Yet, I did poorly in the department among students who were excellent at English. My mother let me study English from a very young age, but I was so behind my peers, who already had practiced conversational speaking a lot. I, who had been an excellent student, was so depressed due to my poor performance in the department, but again the pride in my department, which was highly ranked in the college, kept me positive, like in the case of my high school. Another good memory, which brings me a strong sense of pride in myself, was directing a play in the English language when I was a senior. For the play I really worked hard and enthusiastically during the semester, and finally I won first place. I was very satisfied, and even today, I am still so proud that "I directed a play in English." In my junior year, I worked as a private tutor part-time. I didn't feel any necessity to work and didn't want to do, but my mother recommended it as an experience, so I did it for a year on the condition

that my parents kept giving me an allowance. After all, I was satisfied with tutoring because I really enjoyed spending twice the amount of money.

Before taking the employment examination to become a teacher, I had to make a decision about where I would work between a small city and a metropolitan. Although my parents lived in the small city, I did not want to work in a rural area or a small town. Thus, I finally chose this metropolitan to work in and took the exam. After passing the exam, I have been employed by this regional office of education and have worked at this school for four years. In my first year, I was an English teacher, and then was a homeroom teacher for 5th and 4th grades. This year, I am teaching 2nd grade. When I was an English teacher I taught three multicultural students. As a homeroom teacher, I had never met any multicultural students until this year. This is the first time having a multicultural student in my classroom. Regarding multicultural people on a personal level, I only heard about a distant relative from my mom. The uncle, who lives in a rural area, had a binational marriage in his 40s or 50s, but the bride, a Vietnamese, was in her early 20s. Moreover, because that kind of marriage is not something to be proud of, the husband's mother has kept the woman staying home. How pitiful she is.

My duty at this school is teaching a gifted class for AP credit to upper grade students. I prefer to teach gifted students who quickly understand my instructions better than my classroom students. In my classroom, there are many underachieving students, and it is so difficult to teach those who don't understand. I don't know what I should teach them. Yet, it is easier to teach the gifted class, which doesn't have any underachieving students.

Now, I am also a graduate student majoring in Children and Early Childhood Education. I should have started the master's program earlier and have regrets when I compare myself to friends who have already completed their graduate work. My mother

and uncle, who was a principal at an elementary school, advised me to start my master program as soon as possible, and they recommended the English major again. Yet, I really hated the idea of experiencing stress over English again, so I chose another major related to teaching for primary grades. I like my master program except for one thing: the program is opened to unqualified students who are not elementary school teachers.

I am really satisfied with my job. I earn as much as I need, I can enjoy my own time without overwork, and during school vacations I can enjoy traveling. For this summer vacation, I'm planning to go on a trip for 21 days to Europe again, which I visited two years ago. I don't have anything to do for this summer vacation, so a trip is something I can do. You know, the more I travel to foreign countries, the more I realize that my country is so good to live in.

I am experiencing pressure to marry soon, so if you know a good man please set me up on a blind date. I hope to meet someone who goes to church; has a high socioeconomic family background, at least similar to mine; and is competent. I mean the person has to have graduated from a good college and have a good job in a major company. I know I am picky, but I cannot give up the conditions of family background and job because I compare myself to many friends who married doctors or office workers in major companies.

Sociocultural Understanding

Sae-Ra noted that she was from an upper-middle class family and had a secure family background; she explicitly expressed how proud she was of her prestigious experiences from childhood to the present. Although she encountered slumps in both high school and college, she consoled herself by reminding herself that she belonged to exceptional top-ranked groups, from which she could derive a sense of competence.

As she was identifying herself as a superior and highly qualified individual, she explicitly used the word "abnormal" five times during four interviews when she described a few troublesome students in her classroom or the students' families. In addition, she often positioned certain groups of others as lower compared to her high status. Here are some instances:

- *Smart students who deserve gifted education and non-smart students who should never come to a gifted class (when talking about her duty teaching a gifted class; 1st interview)*
- *A normal family and a very odd family of a tardy student (when introducing a student; 2nd interview)*
- *A traveler, I and a lowly clerk at a shop (in a story of her European trip; 3rd interview)*
- *We, helpers and the others, recipients of our trifling alms (when she talked about UNICEF, the United Nations Children's Fund; 4th interview)*

She segregated people into two groups: one as having deterministic deficiency and the other as capable and superior to the former. Interestingly, this hierarchical understanding of others was heavily dependent on the social capital people possess. When she presented a group as inferior, she preferentially assumed that the group mostly had a low SES background. She even established a link between students who were tardy or naughty and their poor family status. This socioeconomically-oriented thinking took precedence over her racial stereotypes. When I first suggested she imagine a binational marriage for herself, she immediately answered that she would consider only White Americans.

> *I can't help but shun Southeast Asians. Blacks too. Even though there is a criticism of White supremacy, I can't get away from it. For me, Blacks are scary. Southeast Asians are scary too. Is it natural that I choose White? (Laugh) Marriage may be impossible except to Whites. (3rd interview)*

Although she frankly preferred specific races, her response became different when I added a condition. She weighted social class as a factor more than race.

> *However, if there were a Southeast Asian man having a really high status, my mind would be changed. It would change (according to the job position). Social condition is critical to a person. (I consider it as) the reflection of a person's competence. It is always the masses from the developing countries who make trouble in our society, but not the high-ranking officials. So, it depends on their job and academic background. (3rd interview)*

Here she demonstrated a different, more positive attitude towards binational marriage when considering individual social status in spite of her hostility toward certain ethnic backgrounds. Yet, if it was not a specific case, she generally equated foreigners with their national economic power. Thus, she located them according to national rank, including Asians.

> *I love to travel to other countries and have traveled a lot, but I don't like to go to underdeveloped countries because there are so many beggars. I hate those countries. China was the only underdeveloped country I've traveled to so far. I will never go there again. Yet, I love all other developed countries. I would mentally be predisposed against a Chinese person rather than a Japanese person before I ever met either of them. If I heard someone was Vietnamese, I would think he/she comes from a poor and underdeveloped background. (1st interview)*

Due to this hierarchical understanding of individuals by national economic status, she said she was insulted when she was mistaken as a Chinese during travel in Europe (3rd interview). In this vein, it was a matter of course that she was generally disdainful of immigrant people in society, who were mostly from low-ranked countries in her mind. She held a stereotypic concept of them due to their national origin. She viewed migrant workers as "causing social problems" (2nd interview) and "truly" believed migrant wives "were

bought by money, and did not come for love" (1st interview). In turn, Sae-Ra regarded multicultural families in a disgraceful and negative light. She said she was startled when a multicultural student in her school, a child of an immigrant woman from Vietnam, was "not ashamed at all" but told Sae-Ra about her mother "without hesitation" (2nd interview).

Along with this understanding, she even declared, "Actually, I think multicultural society is not good. I don't like multicultural change" (2nd interview). Concomitantly, she was very unhappy about governmental supports for migrant people and multicultural families:

> *Do you know there are really many supports for multicultural families? I think our country really supports the multicultural students too much even though there are other (South Korean) students who are in a worse condition. There are some (South Korean) students who achieve lower, so the support can be used for these students, but . . . nowadays, there is no discrimination against multicultural students; instead, there are advantages for them. I think in the future they may get more advantages even in finding a job. The day will come. People say that this country treats foreigners better than native citizens, so South Koreans are unhappy about it. We don't need to be concerned about the population because they will receive more benefit than us. You know the word 'reverse discrimination'? I think it happens. There is reverse discrimination. (3rd interview)*

It seemed the passage above represents two kinds of thoughts. First, she set multicultural students apart from South Koreans. The former were "others" who took away "our," or South Korean peoples' benefits. Second, she attended to the social aid that multicultural students received but was blinded to the social obstacles they were also confronting. When posing some questions to her in order to draw out her thoughts regarding social inequity and other barriers, she did not even comprehend the questions. She perhaps had no idea about the issue. Only once did she acknowledge the societal ill

feeling against skin color, but her attention just ended at that point. She understood her multicultural student in the same way.

- *If he had a very different skin color, he would get attention from others. Yet, because he is not apparently noticeable, he is fine. So, as I said, I don't think he is a multicultural student. Other students are the same way. Not many students consider him as multicultural; further, the students do not treat him differently for that reason. He is just a student like ordinary students. Cultural difference? No, not at all. He is just a South Korean. I've never thought of it. (3rd interview)*
- *In South Korean culture, it depends on appearance. If there is no physical difference, he/she can be easily assimilated. Yet, if there is an unusual look, he/she would have difficulty being assimilated. (4th interview)*

The student had seemingly no difference in skin color and was able to speak Korean, so Sae-Ra did not consider him to be a multicultural student. Therefore, she assumed that he had no difficulties. It seemed she held a limited understanding about cultural complexity; moreover, she thought bullying was the only trouble multicultural students were exposed to.

Actually, whenever I asked about him, she continually asserted that the multicultural student in her class was not different but just one of the Korean students. Yet, when I asked about his strong point, she mentioned it in relation to his multicultural background.

> *(Silent for a few seconds) (Laugh) Um… if I say the strength, there might be one or two. He is very rhythmical; he always taps on something, so I've thought he may play the drum well. I think this is from his Filipino background. I have the impression that the people in that country like songs and they are very good at music, so he will be advantaged if he is doing that kind of rhythmical performance. Another is that he has very big eyes. He doesn't seem like a multicultural student, but his eyes are really lovely*

(unlike Korean ones). Appearance can be…. (Laugh) a strength, can't it? (4th interview)

Her overall understanding of the multicultural student revealed a stereotypical and essentialist perception of foreign cultures. It seemed that being multicultural meant no more to her than skin color, appearance, or culture, which is exterior and tangible. This simplistic multicultural understanding may also explain her ignorance of the social system described above.

However, she showed a different perspective when I asked how she foresaw his future. Although she was ignorant of social barriers for him, she darkly predicted his future.

He could be successful, but I'm not sure. He has actually many deficiencies. He doesn't write in his journal, work on homework, or bring any supplies. If he moves to the upper grades, he won't be able to catch up even though right now it seems like he is keeping pace with his peers. Actually this academic readiness involves things that can be done through his mother's attention, but he doesn't get any. If these behaviors are repeated, he will come to be recognized as that kind of student and his friends will also dislike him. (4th interview)

The main reason for her expectations about his future involved the absence of his mother's support. It was not a matter of the mother's multicultural background because Sae-Ra was not aware of cultural hindrance, but only a matter of whether or not a mother is present in a family. Unlike ignorance of the social system, it appeared as though she significantly considered parental influence on students. On the other hand, this understanding was perhaps tied to her strong deficit thinking about families from low SES backgrounds. To undergird her deterministic assumptions about his failure, she just pinned the absence of his mother on his future failing although she had previously stated that the

student was performing well at school. That is, she seemed to try to prove her deficit belief as a "rule, or more like a law of nature" through matching "peculiar parents" and "peculiar students" (4th interview).

This attitude may be also explained by a very contradictory understanding of herself. When I asked what she would do if she were not able to get enough parental support in her school days, she said her achievement would be determined by her own efforts regardless of family factors.

> *It is up to my competence. I mean it's up to me how much I do. I think I would do my best in spite of my situation because it happened in my life anyway and I have to live in that condition; in addition, because this society is a place in which I can't be successful if I do not my best. (4th interview).*

This statement did not differ from the understanding she showed throughout her life history; she had kept addressing that her successful outcomes were the result of her competence and effort, while simultaneously discounting her mother's support. For her own success, she identified personal endeavor as a critical factor; while for others, the mother's lack of involvement was the cause for falling behind academically. This contradictory stance seemed rooted in her stereotypes toward the group she regarded as in low social status and also in her ignorance of the advantages she received from her family. In addition, it revealed her indifference to social structure once again. For her, personal success was a matter within the individual or at most of the family's status but not beyond.

DO-JIN

> *Identify myself? (Laugh) Me? Well, I want to say I am a person who seeks rationality. I've tried to prioritize the interests of majority over my personal*

interests. And whatever I do, I've tried to do reasonably. I can't stand anything unreasonable. If something is not ultimately helpful for the future, I think I don't need to do that. This is my thought, and I think this reasonability is one of my mottos. ... I hope that in the future I will be remembered as someone who tried to help others in some useful ways. At this point, I find pleasure in my job because teaching is just the work of helping and improving others. Basically, I am the one who loves to help others. When I help others, I become happy. I think I am altruistic. (4th interview)

Rationality, public interests, usefulness, improvement, and altruism; those were the expressions he adopted to identify himself. The five words may sound irrelevant, but when I heard it at the last interview, I was finally able to map out what I had seen and heard about him up to that time. He was a person who was oriented to effectiveness in attaining success or a goal for himself, his family, and others.

Life History

I am 43 years old and have been teaching for 20 years. I was born in a rural area and my family was not well off. My family clearly belonged to the low-income bracket. Yet, most of my neighbors were in the same condition, so I was not conscious of my family's financial difficulty. I was an unconfident student during elementary school and academically unsuccessful at that time. I ranked 33rd among 55 students on the first test in middle school. Then, my test scores began to continually improve; I think I had a will by myself to study hard beginning with my senior year of middle school. Therefore, for high school admission, I pushed myself to apply to a more competitive city school. I did pretty well in the school.

There were several motivating factors for my decision to enter a college of education. First, I have been a Christian since the 3rd grade, so I looked for a job that

allowed me a day off on Sunday to go to church. For this reason, I thought teaching was the right profession. In addition, my older sister, who was a teacher, told me it offered good job security and income in terms of a secular condition, and my mother also recommended teaching to me due to my characteristics and personality. Moreover, my parents were not able to support my tuition for other general colleges, and they wanted me, as a first son, to have a secure job. Now, I am very satisfied with my decision.

After working at schools in a metropolitan area for seven years, I transferred to a school in a rural area in 2002, where I could earn some credits for a promotion. This school had a pretty unique culture among teacher-members that was similar to the military. Yet, I behaved irreverently, which I was not aware of. For that reason, I incurred other teachers' hatred and later I finally heard about it. Four years later, I again transferred to a much more rural area for additional credits. The school had many multicultural students of Japanese women; all of the Japanese mothers had binational marriages due to religion, Unification Church. The school offered Korean food cooking classes for the mothers and held meetings only for the multicultural parents to meet teachers. I had two Japanese students in my classroom. Until that year, I had never had contact with multicultural people, and one or two TV stars I saw on TV was the extent of my dealings with persons of mixed race in my life. Those mothers were very interested in their children's schooling so the children were performing well. The most difficult or embarrassing moments I experienced happened during history class. I met the students' eyes while I excitedly explained about the wars between our nation and Japan, or our independence movement against Japanese imperialism, and I abruptly wrapped it up.

When I earned maximum regional credits from the two schools, I transferred to this school in 2010. Prior to the transfer, I asked the previous vice principal of this school, with whom I had worked at another school, to appoint me as director of curriculum. When the

position was secure for me, I came to this school because I had to earn positional credits to be promoted. At this school, I served as the director of curriculum for three years, and this year I have an appointment as director of school affairs. I have collected all credits for promotion, so I may be appointed as a vice principal in a few years. It is pretty early to be ready for promotion at my age. I will rank 10th place among 400 fellow graduates of my college. So far, I have not faced any serious problems in my life, and I think I have wisely anticipated and prevented any problems in advance.

In terms of my position, I really enjoy my work because the work of a director of school affairs is relatively easier than the work of a curriculum director, but the treatment is almost like that of the vice principal. Moreover, I do not have any difficulty with the work, which involves dealing with many teachers, because I'm serving their needs in a positive way. As a director of school affairs, I reduce unnecessary work by trying to provide teachers with something useful and essential. Besides, I am very pleased with my job as a male teacher as well. It is definitely advantageous to be a man when taking a leadership role. In addition, because I have both charisma and kindness, female teachers regard me as a kind older brother.

I married a high school teacher in 2002, when I started my master's program majoring in Social Studies. Although we have a dual income, we are not middle class like other teacher couples because we spend a lot of money to support both sets of parents and a church. Yet, I expect we will eventually achieve a middle class lifestyle or better (because both my wife and I will be promoted). I grappled with a way to help my parents, who cannot support themselves without their children's aid. Instead of sending some money monthly, I created a fund for my parents with my siblings' and parents' assets, and I send my parents the interest generated by the fund. I thought this would be the best way to relieve my

parents' anxiety and ease my siblings' burden. I think this idea was really good, and I am proud of what I did.

Even though my teaching profession is important and I've been paying attention to meet the requirement for promotion, it is not that big a deal to me. You know, all teachers will be in the same place after they retire. The most valuable part of my life is my daughter, who is in the 4th grade. I love my daughter most of all, and she is the part of my life that I am most thankful for. My vision is that my daughter becomes a useful person and achieves success in the world; thus, I have put all priorities on my daughter for the future. I completely took care of her until she was six years old, just like a mother does. I played with her a lot until she was three years old; then taught her to read and write Korean at four years old; taught her addition and subtraction at five years old; and at six, I let her master the 2nd grade curriculum. Moreover, she went to the school where I worked for three years (recently, she transferred to a school near my home). Even now, I teach her reading, English, and math at home. We discuss the books she has read, and I get her to practice advanced math. For English, I have provided her English videos since three years old, and English conversational tutoring via phone since age seven. Now she studies middle school English. I'm thinking of increasing the amount of phone tutoring. The reason I help her with English is that that is the subject that will contribute the most to her academic achievement. For me, there is no desire except the hope to see her succeed.

One of my friends married a Chinese woman two years ago when he was 40 years old, but the marriage ended in divorce the next year. He has lived in a rural area and been poor. He knew that he was not able to go with any pretty Korean woman. Only old women were available to him, so he brought a 22-year-old Chinese woman, who couldn't speak even a word in Korean. (Aren't you amazed by the age gap?) Yet, she didn't do housework but only hung out with other Chinese women. That is, she did not make any contribution to

his life at all, and my friend did not get any benefits from her. You know, if there is no love between a couple, married life can have a meaning only when it brings other benefit; otherwise, there is no reason to sustain the marriage. At the beginning, I told him not to have a child for about four years, and I think it was really the right decision for them. If there was a child between them, think about how awful it would have been.

At Sprout Elementary, I do not serve as a homeroom teacher because I have had the additional duty of director. I have been a single subject teacher in charge of the subjects of Moral Education, Music, or English. This year, I am teaching Music again for 3rd to 5th grade. Personally, I love music. I really enjoying teaching music and am going to be a music teacher rather than a homeroom teacher from now until I become vice principal.

Sociocultural Understanding

Do-Jin, a 43-year-old male teacher, was born in a rural area and belonged to a family that was considered low-income while growing up. He said he studied hard and challenged himself to become more competitive during his school years. After graduating from his high school, top-ranked in the region, he was finally admitted to a college of education. Even though he did not talk a lot about his school days, he highlighted the success he earned through his hard work. After becoming a teacher, he sought a way to be promoted and methodically transferred to the schools in which he could earn the required credits for promotion. At the time of our interview, he had collected all the necessary credits for promotion and was awaiting an appointment. Do-Jin was very satisfied with his current situation and pleased by his overall success in his life. Because he thought he had achieved social mobility by his own efforts, he strongly expressed his self-efficacy.

However, he interpreted his success differently from Sae-Ra. He situated the reason for being rewarded for his endeavor in a broader social context:

At that time, there were no private institutions or tutoring. Almost never. At that time whoever studied hard by himself could do well. Regardless of whether they were rich or poor, almost no one got tutored back then. We just stayed late at school and studied. However, nowadays, this has changed. Children do not compete with one another from the same starting line. Assistance is needed to make that leap. If my daughter was born to a multicultural family, I am not sure how well she would have performed. I guess she might have been an underachiever in Math. (4th interview)

Although he perceived his success as his own achievement, he also acknowledged the advantage of parents' financial support. It sounded like he considered socio-cultural and economic capital as a critical factor, which could emasculate the effects of individual effort. Further, he also seemed to be aware that a capital gap resulted in unequal opportunities between individuals. While he was presenting this analytical interpretation, Do-Jin was proud of his "ability and tendency to systemically see from a macro view due to having taken coursework in a Social Studies master's program" (1st interview).

Despite Do-Jin being aware of the inequity embedded in social structures, he was pessimistic about the possibility for change. His macro perspective was limited to the diagnosis of social phenomenon.

- *It's not easy to find a solution. That's why it is a social problem; if there is a solution, it is not (a social problem). It is a very complex matter, so too hard to solve. It can't be solved through only one change. It is a problem rooted in a very long history and system. (2nd interview)*
- *As I see it, it is a very difficult problem. When a social phenomenon is observed, it should be understood as related to the entire social structure rather than as a simple issue, which can be fixed with one modification. (Even if high-stakes tests were removed,) the rich would still be advantaged by having a more distinguished career instead of a*

> *higher test score. After all, our nation has a small amount of territory, so it needs only 10 people among 1000. Therefore, (the society) selects only some who do well, then 990 people have to (be left behind) anyway. There is no other way. (3rd interview)*

He acknowledged the complexity of social inequity and the secured power of the privileged; however, Do-Jin did not expect social transformation to occur. He seemed to believe that an unequal social system was an unavoidable destiny of Korean society. Therefore, rather than challenging the existing structure, he was very concerned about surviving in or adapting to the society as it currently was. It explains why Do-Jin intentionally steered his life toward a goal of succeeding within the given situation and the reason he trained his daughter to fit into it.

> *Therefore, I'm seeking a way for my daughter to be strong within this system. That's why I help her study; I debate with her about readings, devise strategies to solve high-level math questions, and provide English tutoring. Ultimately, she has to be strong enough for the South Korean system, so that she can do well. (4th interview)*

He deeply understood the necessity of assistance for students' academic success and actively supported his daughter in order to enable her to leap ahead in the system. Paradoxically, however, he expressed a negative attitude toward educational aids for multicultural students. It was because he was thoroughly convinced of their failure.

> *I heard there are lots of monetary support now. Yet, our nation actually does not have any obligation to help multicultural people. However, as I see it, there are a lot of them. There is also a lot of support for underachieving students. However, their achievement can't be helped. The problems have been caused from their origins, from their birth. There have been so many complex issues from their birth. (2nd interview)*

Do-Jin believed that multicultural students are inherently deficient so they would not be capable of high achievement in spite of these support systems. It was a very deep-seated belief because it was grounded in dual layers of his racial and class stereotypes.

When I asked Do-Jin about the question—imagining a binational marriage for his daughter, he showed an obvious racial preference:

> *Somehow, I prefer a white guy. Although we do not explicitly discriminate based on race, I can't help but do so when it is a personal matter. Most of all, I have some negative emotions toward the color black. Yet, Obama has changed my thoughts a lot from the idea that Blacks are always ignorant, robbing, and swearing. He clearly shows that is not always the case. However, if my grandchild is black, how much hardship would he/she experience here? He/she would have to go to America. (2nd interview)*

He overtly admitted where he stood on racism and his perception that racism was pervasively operating in Korean society. Further, Do-Jin considered race as much stronger factor than social class, unlike Sae-Ra, who prioritized individual social status over race. He generalized about racial classification first and foremost.

> *Well, if my daughter wanted to marry a guy from India, I couldn't accept it. Even if he were an elite member of the society, I would not agree to the marriage. There is ethnic superiority, and I accept the notion. So, I think my ethnicity is superior, although he might be richer and have higher status. For example, there are Indonesians. Marriage to a person of that ethnic group, which is at the very bottom? No way. However, in the case of Americans and Westerns, I understand it as that they select my daughter, so I am grateful as a recipient. This is the way I think. (2nd interview)*

The passage above revealed a belief he held, that racial hierarchy was static—at the very top were Whites, followed by Koreans, then other Asians. Due to this racial concept, he was not favorable to multicultural people, who were mostly from other Asian countries. Moreover, because he had stereotypes about "lower-grade races," he perceived multicultural social change as an attack on national quality.

> *I, frankly, cannot accept a multicultural society. What I am sure of is that the change is not beneficial . . . . When they come here, they do not throw away their nationality. The people (of the race) who had dirty attributes are still dirty here; the people (of some races) who had lazy behaviors are always slow here and do not work here if they get money. If my daughter played with a friend whose mother were Chinese, I would examine her closely to make sure the child was okay, which I would never do if the child were Korean. The Chinese do not have a good reputation, such as being loud and insistent. (3rd interview)*

He believed that the nation would be disrupted by the multicultural population because he was not only "proud of our single ethnicity and emphasized it" but also contemptuous of the other races. He even worried that "The United States will be also downgraded if the number of Mexicans increases" (2nd interview). It seemed the hierarchical understanding of race, which he embraced deeply, underpinned his deficit thinking on multicultural students.

Yet, his negative conviction about multicultural students' failure was not based upon only this attitude; their parents' social class was another reason for Do-Jin to dismiss these students' chances of success. In the case of immigrant mothers, he regarded them as being low-class members of a low-status ethnic group; the often-Korean fathers were also identified as unqualified members of the society.

The women were people who stayed home after only finishing elementary school. They were removed from any cultural experience. They didn't like to work on the farm, but heard that they could be rich in South Korea. The reason they came here is money. How about the men? Old, single Korean men in rural areas have to marry but no women want them. They are not qualified for marriage. If a man had a binational marriage, it means that the man is a loser in this society. In all aspects, in terms of level of consciousness and financial power, the man is lacking in qualities to make a sound family. Therefore, these families consist of women who need money and men who are lacking. (1st interview)

With this firm stereotype about the binational marriage family, he defined the marriage as "a deal" between losers (2nd interview). He deemed the parents as genetically and culturally deficient; in turn, Do-Jin understood their children, multicultural students, as inherently deficient.

Their children stand far behind the starting line. I can say that their genes (received from their parents) are not so good. Along with poor genes, they experience trouble in language acquisition. Moreover, they miss a critical period of mental development because their mother cannot actively educate their children. You know, 80% of one's brain is developed up to eight years old, but the multicultural children blankly pass through this very important period. Thus, there is no doubt that they fall behind from the beginning. Of course, there might be one exception among more than 100 cases, but it is what I think. Therefore, these multicultural students get along only with underachieving students— you know, even in elementary school, there are groups of high achieving and underachieving students; and so they are gradually alienated from school since they are lagging behind. (2nd interview)

He thought that lack of parental input along with low socioeconomic status would negatively impact multicultural children. He identified South Korean society as one in which "the rich seem to be getting richer, and the poor poorer" and further regarded this

situation as "unchangeable" (3rd interview). Hence, he believed the students' failure was inevitable. This understanding was not only projected onto multicultural students; he applied it to other students from a low SES background.

However, as he said at the beginning, Do-Jin disagreed with governmental provisions for these students. It seems he thought that no amount of support could be enough to make up for their original deficit.

> *If we help those in financial difficulty, to what extent can we help? After all, it doesn't really help. If we send $100,000 to Africa, can it solve any problem there? Ultimately, they have to stand alone. I can tell that the current aids are not lacking. Moreover, even though we provide academic support, they can't accept it. They do not follow it and do not like our support. (Do-Jin, 3rd interview)*

His disagreement was owing to the belief that their struggles were tied to their own backgrounds rather than to the social system. Based on that understanding, he permanently predicted that "the students would earn low positions like their parents, and meet that same kind of person, and live at that same level" (4th interview). Following this train of thought, he submitted to the necessity of multicultural education:

> *Ah, well, they cannot give up marriage, but if they marry, similar kinds of problems will happen. Well, it seems the marriage (frequency) can't be reduced. Then, we have to educate them (multicultural students) well. You see some cases of terrorism by gangs in other countries. If multicultural people become low or discontented, they end up forming gangs. Think about multicultural students; they can't go back to their countries because they do not speak the mother tongue well. So in some way they are Koreans. Thus, we must be careful that these multicultural students do not become a tinderbox for future social conflicts. (3rd interview)*

Therefore, Do-Jin felt that what teachers could do for multicultural students was only "improving their self-esteem or self-respect but nothing else" (1st interview). In addition, he also thought, like Sae-Ra, that if skin color and language were not noticeable, the students were not considered to be multicultural students. Thus, he said it would better to conceal students' multicultural background (2nd interview).

SEONG

The novice 3rd grade homeroom teacher, Seong, based at the same school as Do-Jin, had a unique name that clearly meant "a star." It is not surprising, then, that Seong identified herself as a star; further, she worked hard to improve herself so that she would "shine" more brightly.

> *If you ask me to describe myself, I would say that I am a unique and special person like my name. If my name were not a star but something else, my life would be different. Whenever I introduce myself, I tell people about this star. You know, when I was an elementary school student, a teacher wrote me a letter; it encouraged me to "Polish your star. Even if you are a star, you can be shining only when you diligently polish yourself every day." Since I received the letter, my motto has been this, "Polish the star – myself" (4th interview)*

Life History

I was born in a very rural area, and my grandparents were farmers. My parents are still living there. My family was very poor because they didn't make enough money with farming. Yet, they did their best to support me, so I didn't experience any direct financial difficulties. Looking back on my childhood, I appreciate the fact that I lived close to nature because the environment helped me develop my creativity a lot. My father named

me Seong—that means a star. He is very academic, and my mother is very talented with a sense of beauty.

I went to a very small elementary school, with one class per grade. There were 18 students in my class, and we were in the same class for six years. So, it was natural for me to do whatever I wanted in the classroom like I would do with family. I always raised my hand and freely contributed during lessons. I was class president for many years. I did not have as much stress about tests as students in the city because the concept of testing did not exist in my rural community. Yet, my father emphasized academic work a lot and pushed me to study so I could do very well. However, when I entered middle school in a city, my grades had fallen considerably. I was very shocked at my test score so studied harder, and then I ranked at the top in my class again soon. It was the same in high school. When my grades declined at the beginning, I worked really zealously and achieved a good score shortly after. I was selected to be among the top 12 students who were admitted to a school dormitory. It always happened this way; I initially did poorly, then tried hard and attained something. Overall, I was a model student and received many awards.

At the same time I was a very active and talented person who loved to stand in front of a crowd. I often emceed at school events and appeared on stage at talent shows. I also served as a student leader and organized an exchange meeting with other schools, so I could get new friends and participate in various activities. I'd heard that I was a unique student having a strong personality throughout my school days. Recently, I appeared on a broadcast of a singing contest program a few weeks ago with two of my friends from college. We won an award for popularity. I reported this appearance to the vice principal in advance, but I was so concerned about other teachers' responses. Thankfully, the program showed us as more calm and quiet than we expected, and there was only one colleague who watched the program on TV in school (laugh).

Many people around me, from a young age, told me to be a teacher. They said teaching might perfectly suit my personality and I would do well because I always kindly taught my elementary-school classmates whenever they asked me for help. After having failed to be admitted to another college, the next year I entered a college of education in 2009. At the college, I also tried to earn a good GPA. I think I fit well with the college because most courses required making presentations on a project, which I liked and did well. Yet, the high GPA was not given freely but was reflective of my effort. Because most projects were group projects, if the first outcome by my group was not satisfactory to me, I totally redid the project by myself. It was so stressful that I cried several times, but I couldn't help but re-do it until it became perfect. It's my personality.

I did my student teaching at an elementary school affiliated with the college. The teachers at the school were all excellent and outstanding in the city, and the school was known as operating the most credible and rigorous program for student teaching. Thus, I applied to the school to maximize my student teaching opportunity for the sake of preparing myself well. Actually, most students in the college avoided the school, but only some who were eager for development applied like me. (Laugh) During the entire period of two weeks, I did my best without sleep. In spite of my hard work, I couldn't be outstanding among other student teachers because they were much more excellent and enthusiastic in learning and working than me. Thus, my performance seemed poor compared to them; I was even known as a half-hearted student teacher. The period of student teaching was full of stress for me.

In college, I joined a traditional Korean percussion band. The band demanded a lot of time— I had to practice every day for performances and had field training for a long time during each vacation. I didn't even enjoy weekends due to practice. It was really challenging for me to endure all that hard training and practice, but on the other hand I

had so much fun with good friends in the band. Due to the band, I visited Russia once for educational service activities. We taught Korean-Russians Korean culture and traditional music, and gave a performance.

Although I was very busy, I tutored part-time to earn spending money. One of my tutoring opportunities was provided by the college. It was a mentorship program for elementary students from low-income families or multicultural students. I did not work directly with any multicultural students, but I saw one sitting at the next table while I was tutoring a South Korean student. It was the very first time I encountered a multicultural student in my life. I was interested in the appearance of the student, who looked different from us, but instantly I was very surprised that the student spoke Korean like other South Korean students. I can't forget that moment because it was shocking to me.

I graduated this February and started my teaching career in March. Except for student-teaching experiences, this is the first school I have been teaching at and the first semester I have been an official teacher. I expected I would be buried in preparation for teaching and my students, but I am not. I think I can and have to do better. If I prepared more, the lesson would be better, but I think I'm doing so poorly and everything I am doing seems useless. I feel so sorry for myself due to my poor performance as a teacher. I think I need to work harder; I have to do my best more of the time. I have to polish myself more. I have been lazy, so I think my star has been covered with dust. You know, I have been a special person just like my name, but I feel that I am recently becoming one of the common ones.

Sociocultural Understanding

Seong, describing herself as a star, expanded her star-identity as a symbol of self-improvement. Since she received the letter from her teacher when she was young, as

mentioned at the beginning of this section, she diligently strived for self-improvement. She polished herself to shine more brightly and consequently she gained notable achievement in her school days. During her first semester as a teacher, Seong was also passionate to improve herself through accepting and applying new teaching practices as well as always preparing lessons in advance. Hence, it seemed natural that she believed whoever did their best would be successful. Meanwhile, when she talked about the underachievement of the students from a low SES background and of the multicultural students at school, I asked her what she thought of their future. She answered in an indifferent way:

> *Whenever they put their minds toward succeeding, they can overcome their disadvantages. For example, they can broaden their experience via books. I think it is a matter that they can surely overcome according to how they behave later in life. (3rd interview)*

It seemed she believed that one's achievement could be earned through personal effort in spite of surrounding hardships; this response was just as exactly I expected. However, she revealed a very different idea when faced with the question, "If you had been a multicultural student, what would you be like now?" In this situation, she skeptically described her imaginary self.

> *I would be… I might have a lot of dissatisfaction and be negative in some way. I might be resentful toward my mother. It might be different because mothers have a huge influence. Moreover, if a mother is a foreigner, the culture she imparts is different, so I might be different. I would be changed somehow. I mean, I would not study hard; I'm not sure whether I would go to school or not. It would be different from the present, wouldn't it? Most of all, there would be no support from my family; I think they would not support me. And my mother would be disinterested in my school life, and she could not contribute to it. So, I would not perform well. If those kinds of influences accumulated, I might be struggling. If I couldn't communicate with my mom, it would affect my character formation as well. (4th interview)*

She expected her failure as inevitable. This prediction was inconsistent with the way she expected other multicultural students' future success. Because she applied many difficulties, which multicultural students might experience, for herself; it is evident that she was already aware of disadvantages faced by multicultural students. However, she did not consider the barriers for them[22], but carelessly answered until it became a personal matter. While I was curious about a reason of the gap, her indifference toward multicultural students stood out throughout entire interviews.

Actually, she consistently showed disinterest in the conversation of multicultural or social-equity topics over four interviews. Most of the time she responded in only a few words: "I don't know. Well, it is a hard question," "I don't know how to answer" (3rd interview) and "I've never thought about it. I've not deliberated about the issue yet" (4th interview). It was hard to sustain a conversation due to her lack of engagement. Even when the conversation turned from abstract questions to her own multicultural student, Bo-Mi, she seldom expressed a sense of empathy. When I asked about her, Seong commented briefly:

> *I've thought she is same as other ordinary students. In the case of Bo-Mi, she does as well as other ordinary students except that she doesn't work on homework. She is fine compared to other multicultural students, who are bullied for their different skin color. There are some students who don't know she is multicultural, and some know. Yet, it seems that there is no bullying for this reason. They are young. (Seong, 2nd interview)*

[22]Interestingly, Seong's contradictory response reminds us of Sae-Ra's. While Sae-Ra recognized a barrier of multicultural students, the absence of family support; she expected her success because she thought her ability would overcome the barrier. Whereas, she assured multicultural students' failure due to their deficiency as low SES family members.

Like the other two teachers, she assumed that skin color was the only factor influencing multicultural students' school experience. Seong repeated that Bo-Mi was not different in both language and appearance, so the student must not have any other issues in school. Seong's apathy was also revealed in a conversation over the case of a multicultural student in a hypothetical scenario.[23] Seong seemed to have viewed multicultural education as someone else's responsibility.

> *If there were an alternative school only for multicultural students, I would say let's send him to that school. It might be better to go there because the current school can't treat him well or support him. I'd send him. Then, how would I inform the student? Um, I would persuade him by saying, "the school is better for you; there are many friends who understand you; it is helpful for your future; it is a good choice; if you need any help, please contact me." I would say it like that. (3rd interview)*

Her detached attitude was found again in relation to a language issue. While she kept saying Bo-Mi spoke Korean well, I asked Seong how she would support a multicultural student who was not good at Korean.

> *If I have a multicultural student who can't speak Korean well, what I can do? I might feel concern, but… I wouldn't require her to do a lot. I would let the student do what she was capable of, not like the other students whom I ask to do this and that. Because I can't make a difference, I might leave the student and ask a bilingual teacher for help. The teacher teaches that kind of student in the afternoon, doesn't she? There might be a Korean lesson the bilingual teacher offers for that kind of student— the multicultural students. I think this is the best solution. (3rd interview)*

[23]This scenario is Number 4 in Appendix B.

Seong drew a line between multicultural education and general education, and she separated herself and her teaching work from the responsibility for multicultural education. After attending a teacher training from a manager of a nearby cultural center, she reported that what she took away from the training was that she would contact the center when she has a problem regarding multicultural students (2nd interview).

It seemed her indifferent attitude was based on her perception that "there [were] really many benefits for multicultural students" (1st interview) and "they [were] receiving so many types of support from the country" (2nd interview). She expressed her willingness to highly depend on these aids; at the same time, she questioned the effectiveness of these support systems.

> *Look at Bo-Mi. She receives a lot of supports, but she is not (doing well). On Monday she has a tutor, goes to the counseling office, and gets an extra lesson for Math. On Tuesday, a male teacher comes to her from a multicultural center. Even though she gets these things, I know it is too early to judge but anyway her current performance is not good. Thus, I'm questioning the effect. Of course, it might be better than doing nothing, but… Is it dependent upon the individual? However, I think in this stereotypic way because there is no excellent student among any multicultural students. (4th interview)*

This quote exposed her deficit thinking on multicultural students. Even though she had not met many multicultural students as a first-year teacher, she easily generalized from a few cases or accepted the common notion about them. Moreover, it seemed both her indifference and her deficit thinking toward multicultural students were caused by her strong rejection of the multicultural population. The quote below was Seong's answer when I asked about any suggestions she had in response to her dissatisfaction with the current assistance policies.

> *As a countermeasure, I know it doesn't make sense but, can we first of all stop the multicultural change? If we got rid of them, it would become the most neat and tidy solution. However, then the single men on farm can't marry, can they? This idea can solve the problem, but it is not possible; so, I don't know what we can do. (3rd interview)*

She casually said this as if it meant nothing to her, but I was clearly able to catch that she disagreed with multicultural social change. More generally, Seong told me that she preferred "whatever was the Korean thing to the foreign styles"; she did not even like any American or Japanese songs, which most of her peer group were really into (1st interview). However, her antagonism toward multicultural people in Korean society was much different from her inclination to Korean culture and art. The former was grounded in her racism.

> *Racial discrimination is a serious problem in other countries. I think we have it as well in this country. It is problematic. However, that is… it is natural. It is not something as easy to get rid of as just saying, 'don't do that.' It is our instinct to discriminate among people. I feel different toward Whites and Blacks when they ask me something or just when I see them passing by. It is subconscious, a matter of instinct, which education can't change. (3rd interview)*

Like other teachers, Seong took White supremacy for granted and had hostility toward those of African descent. Furthermore, Seong regarded this attitude as an unchangeable instinct. In addition, she ranked ethnicities according to their national economic status, which was "a critical factor in the image of a nation" (3rd interview). She also understood the foreign population in Korean society as consisting exclusively of immigrant wives who "came here not for love" (1st interview). Therefore, she generally looked down on multicultural people.

Besides, I noticed her apathy again in her understanding of being in a minority. I asked her about a moment in her life when she felt what is was like to be in the minority.

> *Me? If I have to say it, I'd like to say it is right now. (Laugh) I am a novice teacher with almost no teaching experience. Well, I really enjoy it; yet, I feel uncomfortable when I ask something. Whom should I ask? Although I ask questions, I'm concerned about whether the other teachers are annoyed. I also worry if I am asking about something that is obvious. (4th interview)*

Just after she talked about her difficulty in an unfamiliar culture and system as above, I asked her to apply this situation to multicultural students. Initially, she approached them with a reflection from her own experience, but she quickly switched to the opposite perspective.

> *As I think from the minority stance, I come to understand their hardship. (Laugh) Yes, they might have a hard time. However, if you look at Bo-Mi, she is very active and even unconstrained. I am amazed by how much she is this way. Rather, it is better to say she is tactless. I think most multicultural students are like that. Another multicultural student I saw before was also too tactless and said whatever she wanted to. Bo-Mi is the same. They don't know what kind of behavior is considered shameful in this culture. They don't know the culture; therefore, they can ask questions without restraint. I think that's why they behave this way. (4th interview)*

When navigating an unfamiliar culture herself, Seong saw her inexperience as a barrier to asking questions; in contrast, she regarded this inexperience for multicultural students as a basis for unrestricted behaviors. This contradictory view may explain her mental and emotional detachment from multicultural students, which precluded the possibility for sympathizing with them. Furthermore, in relation to the social class issue, she showed her stereotypes toward students from low SES backgrounds.

> *This school's students do not live in a rich neighborhood. This community is poor. So they don't even know the basics of how to take care of themselves. So, I have doubts about what I should teach. Do I even teach these things? For example, personal hygiene and so on . . . (1st interview)*

Seong said she had not known at first the condition of the school's local community because it was her first semester, yet she came to be aware of these conditions through fellow teachers' observations (4th interview). Along with the comments she heard, Seong understood family socioeconomic background to be a major cause of her students' low achievement.

YOO-JEONG

> *When I entered the classroom, there were two teachers, but I couldn't figure out which of them was the immigrant bilingual teacher. Both looked just like any other South Korean. I did not know to whom I had to say hello. When I hesitated to move in, one of them spoke a single word. I was a little bit surprised and instantly knew that she was the teacher. Her accent definitely told me that she was a nonnative. (A field note on the day of 1st interview)*

Yoo-Jeong, a bilingual teacher at Pebble elementary school, was born in China, but she has Korean ancestry; thus, her outward appearance did not reveal that she was from China. Even though she had lived in South Korea for 20 years, she still possessed a unique intonation. As an international student who had left my homeland and struggled with a foreign language, I greatly empathized with her; simultaneously, she also opened up to me when she learned that I was living in a foreign country.

Life History

My great-grandfather crossed the border to Yanbian in China from Hoeryong in Korea when my grandfather was three or four years old. He and his family settled there, and my grandfather married a Korean women who had immigrated just like him. My father was also born there. When my father was very young, my grandfather moved to Shenyang[24], which was a much larger city close to Beijing. Since then, my family has lived there. As my grandfather displayed his marketing skills, my family was able to live well. Actually, there was no poverty there; everyone in the city was rich due to rice farming. My father married a Korean-Chinese woman who was born in Yanbian, and my parents had me and my older brother.

My parents kept saying that we are Korean and forced us to speak Korean. They still don't even speak Chinese well to this day. I went to a Korean-Chinese school from elementary to high school. In my neighborhood, there were only five Korean-Chinese families; all of the others were Chinese. Thus, I had to speak Chinese outside the home and Korean inside it. During my childhood, I fought a lot with Chinese children who bullied me for being Korean Chinese. If I lost once, it ended there, and all the other Chinese children would start bullying me. So, I had to beat them at any cost. However, with the exception of my early childhood, I had no problem with that issue. This was because my hometown was a big city and did not remark on the difference between Korean-Chinese and Chinese people, unlike Yanbian, which had discrimination. Actually, I was identified as Chinese from my young age despite going to Korean schools in China. They taught I am Chinese, but merely Korean "Chinese." China educated us by saying "you can keep your language because you are minority tribe, but your root is in China." You know, early

[24]97.09% of Korean-Chinese individuals resided in three provinces of Northeast China, and 42.77% of them settled in *Yanbian*, a small town in one of the provinces according to the census in 1990. *Shenyang* is the capital city of one province and also the largest city in the three provinces. Further, it is counted as one of the 10 largest capital cities in all of China.

education is powerful, so I think I am Chinese. I hadn't learned about Korean history at school while I learned European, American and Japanese history. It was probably that Korea was not important because its territory was too small.

I majored in material engineering as a university student. After graduation, I worked at a company as an engineer. In 1992, diplomatic ties were established between China and South Korea. Since that year, many Korean companies entered China. At the company, I met my husband, a South Korean man. On August 1st, 1993, I came to South Korea after celebrating our wedding in China, and on the 20th of the same month I changed my citizenship. At that time, international marriage was very rare, so people in my hometown thought that I had gone to a "strange country." A negative image of South Korea was prevalent in China due to ideological education through movie. It described North Korea as a rich and peaceful country and South Korea as a poor and dangerous country. Therefore, my family and I were also very reluctant to marry a South Korean man. A critical factor that enabled me to make a decision of international marriage was my fiancé's promise that we would live in China after a short visit to South Korea. Yet, he did not keep the word and it has already been 20 years in South Korea. Another reason was his parents. They were so nice and treated me well; they were rich and guaranteed financial support. If there was no assurance of financial stability, I would not have married him. Still, my husband is making a living with a rental building, which was purchased with the help of his parents.

I have two children. The older child is a son who is a college student and now in the military service. The younger one is a daughter, a high school student. When they were young, I spoke Chinese at home. Yet, as I saw my son was confused in his preschool, I began speaking Korean. He did not earn good academic scores at the beginning, so I enthusiastically contributed to his education. Right after, he placed in a good rank at

school. In college, he received the biggest scholarship in his department. I think they haven't had any serious issues because of their background. Close neighbors already knew that I was from China. Due to my unique accent in Korean, they easily noticed, so I voluntary revealed my identity in order to prevent rumor and gossip.

Because my parents-in-law and my husband did not allow me to go outside and work, I was a homemaker until recently. There were no jobs available for me either. Even though I have done some Chinese tutoring through acquaintances as a part-time job, it was unimaginable for me to work in this society. Thus, I killed time in a fitness center or a swimming pool as I became used to life in South Korea and my children grew up. However, one day, while I was looking up a class list of community centers on the city homepage in 2010, I saw an advertisement about a free class for multicultural women offered by a private university. It was my first time getting involved with a multicultural event, and through my chance discovery of this class, I learned about other classes.

That summer, I took a training course called "Preparation of Multicultural Parent-Lecturers," which was organized by an office of education. When I finished the course, the office of education called me and asked me to apply for the position of a bilingual teacher at an elementary school. At that time, I did not know that kind of job even existed. Luckily, I was hired, and the office of education assigned me to this school in 2011; it is now my third year at this school. I'm caring for 13 multicultural students in this school. There are students from China, North Korea, and the Philippines. Because I am Chinese, I feel closer to students with a Chinese background. From this semester, I am additionally working for one student as a translator-helper. I work in two positions at this school.

Fortunately, starting this spring semester, I was also appointed as a part-time instructor for a Chinese class in a college of education. There was one spot for a lecturer for the class, and the college sent the job opening announcement to all bilingual teachers.

It said they would have a document examination and then an interview. Yet, there was no interview, but the college just informed me of the result. For documents, I submitted my vita, diploma, and certification from the training course. Actually, it is not easy to adjust myself to this hectic schedule with three jobs after the former housewife days of dull afternoons, but I want to keep up this level of work at the college. I hope to continue the position next semester and am waiting for news from the college.

My family also really loves the position. My husband has always wanted me to stop working because the job as a bilingual teacher does not earn enough money. It is really little money. Yet, once I started working at the college, he seemed to like it. My daughter also likes it. When she said to her friends that I work at a college, they thought it might be a community college. Yet, her friends changed their attitude when she said it is a college of education, you know here the college is at a very high level. She even asks me to work only at the college. (Laugh) My neighbors also changed their views of me. They were surprised and kept asking how I could make it.

However, in some sense, I feel regret when I think of my friends in China who already have attained high positions in their careers, such as professor or senior manager. If I were in China, I would be like that. Of course, I've advanced from 3 years ago, but still ...

Sociocultural Understanding

Yoo-Jeong, who was born and grew up in China, clearly identified herself as a Chinese woman. She said she is "Chinese in spite of Korean blood." She did "not want anyone to take away her Chinese identity" (3rd interview), and, in fact, was very protective when there were attacks on her identity. Yoo-Jeong tried to inculcate a Chinese identity in

her children even if they disagreed with her: "You have roots in China and your country of origin is China" (3rd interview). She recounted one anecdote in a firm voice.

> *When my son was a teenager, he told me that his friends teased him due to my Chinese origins. They asked him, "Is your mom a Chang-gae[25]?," I responded like this: "Chang-gae originally had a good meaning. It means an owner or a boss. They didn't know this background; that's why they said like that. Never mind, but tell them to learn." (2nd interview)*

She told me that if any South Koreans treated her badly because of her nationality, she discontinued the relationship. Yoo-Jeong, who declared that she did not have as strong an attachment to South Korea as to her country, expressed dissatisfaction at her status that is "a minority" in South Korea (3rd interview). Further, she criticized South Koreans as disdainful of foreigners and dismissed their attitude as pathetic ethnocentrism.

However, she also indirectly disclosed her hierarchical understanding of ethnicity. Yoo-Jeong differentiated Chinese from other immigrant women and positioned the Chinese background as superior. Like other Korean participant-teachers, she ranked Asians according to their global power and educational quality.

> *You know, there is hierarchy among foreigners (in South Korea). Korean-Chinese are the most powerful and earn the highest income; the lowest level is the Vietnamese. Among binational marriage couples, the Chinese live relatively well, followed by Vietnamese and Filipinos. While I was taking the training course, I could see that the Chinese women were more powerful than other foreign women. Furthermore, the number of Chinese women is large, so the Chinese women seize leadership. If some positions open up, then the Chinese get them before other immigrant women. … In the training course, the 27 students were all Chinese except for only nine. The Chinese were the biggest group. Also, the women who had a high level of education were all*

[25]"Chang-gae" is a Korean ethnic slur referring to the Chinese, like "Chink" in English.

Chinese. The Filipinas were a little bit educated, but there were no Vietnamese women who had graduated college. For them, even graduating from high school is considered good. (3rd interview)

She revealed her pride in China and at the same time expressed a negative perception of other Asian countries. Along with her understanding of national rank, she also had stereotypes about multicultural families. Although she was a member of a multicultural family herself, Yoo-Jeong distinguished herself from common immigrant wives in several aspects. She had a marriage based on love, unlike the women who entered Korea through a marriage agency, "risking their lives for the fantasy of being rich." Moreover, she came from a capital city, whereas most of the foreign women in Korea came from rural areas. In addition, she had no financial problems, unlike others who were "in a bad circumstance and so benefited from governmental aid" (3rd interview). The more Yoo-Jeong detached herself from them, the more her stereotypes toward multicultural families came into focus.

Binational marriage has become common. Recently, Vietnamese are the biggest group. Instead of Chinese, there are mostly Vietnamese. The reason? Above all, is it for money, isn't it? They who come for money risk their lives. I do not agree with that kind of marriage. I see a couple that consists of a 52-year-old husband and a 29-year-old Vietnamese wife. In that case, they seem like a father and a daughter. When I see the wife, I feel sorry for her, and I want to tell off the husband. The wives might come with illusions of a rich life here. However, the men who engage in a binational marriage do not have a high social status. They are the ones who were not able to marry. If they are rich, they find a South Korean wife instead of bringing a wife from a foreign country. Particularly, men in rural areas can't marry, and that's why most of them resort to binational marriages. (3rd interview)

Although she negatively viewed most multicultural families as low SES groups like the other participant-teachers, she was unique in presenting her thoughts on multicultural education. She did not believe that every multicultural student was poorly achieving. Further, she was concerned about segregation between multicultural students and South Korean students.

> *This (multicultural education) is not necessary. Among multicultural students, there are some doing well and some doing poorly. Among South Korean students, there are also some doing well and some doing poorly. So, there's no need to identify all multicultural students as low achieving; if there are underachieving multicultural students, they can get additional instruction in a general underachieving students' class. … Only for the recently entered multicultural students, they need to be taught separately, and later, when they are adjusted, they should be transferred to an ordinary class. They have to live in Korean society, but if we gather them into a special class, then they become a separate group and they have friends only from that group. I don't think that is good. Even though there are special or alternative schools, I think they should eventually go to ordinary schools as soon as they have obtained a basic (adjustment) education. (3rd interview)*

She highlighted the importance of desegregating multicultural students, blending them in with South Korean students. She believed that separating multicultural students resulted in segregation and further maladjustments to South Korean life. She recalled the time her children were in elementary school and thought it was better to eliminate segregation:

> *At that time, there was no issue about being "multicultural." I think it was better when there was no term for "multicultural." Because there was no term, these students were able to integrate with their peers. … Now, they are identified with a specific term, like you are something and something. I feel it is segregation due to these labels. I don't think that's beneficial. (2nd interview)*

Yoo-Jeong was concerned about segregation, so she asserted that multicultural education should be deemphasized. Nevertheless, similarly to the other teachers, she was indifferent to any other sociocultural issues the multicultural students might experience except language and achievement. She understood the 13 multicultural students in her school had no problem in school because they had the same skin color and so did not stand out. Rather, she said they were "blessed with the fortune of having abundant aids" (2nd interview). However, Yoo-Jeong was solely aware of a language barrier which multicultural students face. While she understood the students showed weakness in the language, despite exhibiting fluency, she did not perceive this weakness to be the result of an innate deficiency.

> *They can speak all basic expressions. Yet, they have a limitation in something like vocabulary. It is because there are gaps in the size of the parents' vocabulary. I heard from a professor that if an ordinary mother usually speaks 500 words at home, a professor speaks about 1000 words.… If an ordinary mom says that many words, then how about (multicultural mothers?) … So, the children have a more limited vocabulary because their mothers do. It is not noticeable in ordinary conversation, but they certainly show a difference in interpreting sentences. My children, too. They can't understand sentences well. They are not good at language arts. They incorrectly understand the meaning. (3rd interview)*

Aside from vocabulary, she also regarded their underachievement as the result of "a lack of opportunity" (2nd interview). She understood the current educational system advantaged only students who received active parental financial support, instead of rewarding the most talented. She thought that in this system "the parents of multicultural students who were not wealthy, could not provide well for their children" (3rd interview).

However, she was not in favor of the governmental assistance for multicultural students. She perceived there were already too many support systems in place that were "almost for free" (3rd interview) and flatly expressed her opinion that the number of these programs should be downsized.

> *My children have never received any benefits. Others are easily mistaken in thinking that my children are receiving a lot of assistance, so if I say there is nothing, many don't believe me. However, I don't wish to expand the benefits more even for my children. I think it should be given to someone who is really in need. Although we don't receive benefits, this is as it should be. There might be someone who really needs it; yet, if we spend too much on welfare, the social debt will be transferred to the next generation. I don't think this is a good idea. Actually, I don't like social welfare. You know, just think of a family, if a family keeps spending money, it will soon be in debt. If we spend it all and then go into debt and spend again, our children will have to take care of all the debt. Then, the country would perish. Benefits? It is all debt. It might be good right now, but think of the future. So, I'm opposing the idea that welfare should be expanded indefinitely. (3rd interview)*

She very assertively objected to the assistance policies. Yoo-Jeong, who had grown up in a secure family and continued an affluent lifestyle after marriage, positioned herself as a taxpayer and other multicultural families as benefit recipients who were "extorting us" (3rd interview). However, she showed a different attitude toward her benefit. She identified her job as a benefit given her due to her minority status: "I think this position is really a benefit for us. The work can be definitely done by other South Korean teachers, of course. Yet we are intentionally hired" (3rd interview). Yet, she eagerly hoped to continue her position. This contradiction may explain her self-interest-based thinking.

This logic was also found in a conversation over social transformation. Although she viewed the educational system as problematic, Yoo-Joeng believed, like Do-Jin, that

the system would endure in spite of any intervention. Moreover, Yoo-Jeong rejected the notion of changing it due to her own possible loss.

> *Right now, we go to college according to a test score, and the score determines an individual's life. It can't be helped; the society has to discriminate somehow between deserving and undeserving students. It is so sad but students from rich families will do well and students from poor families will do not well. No matter what kind of system is introduced, it would be like that. Students of poor background can't be successful. It can't be changed. It is impossible. If the system of an entrance examination is changed, people will adjust themselves to the new system. Parents will do whatever it takes in order to send their children to a (high-ranked) college. It is in the nature of Koreans. Chinese behave in the same way. Anyway, we can't change our blood (nature), so we can't fix the problem. It is better to adjust to the current system because it can't be changed. Whatever the scenario, if the system is changed, I think first and foremost in terms of how my children might be negatively impacted. (3rd interview)*

In sum, she refused this systemic transformation because she worried that if she could not adapt to the new system as fast as other South Korean mothers, her daughter would fall behind. It seems that her thoughts were trapped in a zero-sum game of gain and loss for herself and her own family members. This statement harked of some benefits given to the Korean-Chinese minority in China, which Yoo-Jeong described: her Korean elementary school had the most advanced facility due to preferential treatment for minority groups; Korean-Chinese in *Yanbian* can have two children in spite of the one-child policy; Korean Chinese earn 10 points as an incentive on the college entrance examination; and Korean Chinese are given relatively easier Chinese language exams (3rd interview). It seems she did not critically reflect on these memories, which she experienced or at least was aware of.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

These four sketches provided an in-depth introduction to the sociocultural identities of the figures, Sae-Ra, Do-Jin, Seong, and Yoo-Jeong. Their multi-layered life histories from childhood to the present, like layers of sedimentary rock, revealed the self-understanding that each figure constructed upon their history (Holland et al., 1998). The first-person narration brightly illustrated how the teachers identified themselves. The sociocultural understanding section that followed showed their understanding of others and society, interlocked with but beyond self- understanding.

Through her privileged experiences, enabled by her upper-middle class family's support, Sae-Ra understood her successful performances as evidence of her own superior ability and identified herself as a competent person. Although she was more blinded to societal issues, she was highly status-oriented and applied a hierarchical understanding of the SES background on various groups of people. Do-Jin, who managed his life through making the best use of beneficial opportunities for his goals and targets, valued effectiveness for success. He believed the social system is unchangeable, so to success needs to be fit into the system; yet, simultaneously he held a very strong deficit thinking on multicultural students and students from low SES backgrounds. Seong, from a young age, identified herself as a star who must tirelessly advance herself to shine brightly. Thus, she not only enjoyed getting attention, but also tried her very best to excel. Interestingly, she held hostility toward multicultural people, which displayed itself as cold indifference. Yoo-Jeong, who was a promising young woman in China, held pride in her Chinese identity. After coming to South Korea, she was an ethnic minority in the society, but she maintained an affluent lifestyle. She understood multicultural students' environmental disadvantages but had also protective attitudes about her own interests.

Most interestingly, even though the four participants had lived in different life paths and been situated in the diverse contexts, several common sociocultural understandings were found among them. First, all of the participant-teachers held deeply entrenched hierarchical understandings of race and class. Second, the four teachers were less than enthusiastic toward multicultural issues and held negative sentiments toward multicultural people. The participants openly revealed their deficit thinking on multicultural groups while the teachers positioned them low in the hierarchy. Moreover, they regarded the deficiency these groups possessed as an innate trait of the group. Third, when they put themselves in the multicultural people's shoes, they applied different lenses on themselves and showed contradictory understandings. Lastly, overall, they seemed to lack critical consciousness about difference, culture, inequity, and privilege. Although they admitted that some of their understanding were biased or stereotypic, they did not reflect on or challenge their thoughts but embraced them as natural and unavoidable.

The teachers' sociocultural identities aligned with the discursive frame of multiculturalism found in South Korea, presented in Chapter Four. Their negative notions and antagonism toward multicultural people, their disinterest in multicultural education, and their stereotypic image of multicultural students perhaps revealed that the participant-teachers accepted the prevalent discourses in society. Meanwhile, this chapter was still a detailed prologue to Chapter Six. The next chapter will elaborated on how they negotiated these sociocultural understandings with a focus on their classroom practices.

Chapter 6

Practices: Negotiating Sociocultural Identities

We have finally arrived at the last chapter for this study's findings. Chapter Four described both the broad and narrow sociocultural backgrounds inhabited by the participant teachers. Then, the following chapter illuminated these teachers' sociocultural identities—their understanding of themselves, multicultural people, and multicultural society. On the one hand, the individual participants showed various understandings; at the same time, their multicultural understandings had commonalities, corresponding to the discursive frame in the society at large. This finding makes clear that the formation of teachers' sociocultural identities cannot happen apart from their sociocultural surroundings. However, that is not the end of the story. The identities neither were merely inscribed by nor simply conformed to the existing discourses and locations. Instead, each teacher-subject authored his/her own identity as he/she actively developed, reconfirmed, reorganized, or reclaimed an identity. Chapter Six explores this subjective process of how the teachers fashioned their sociocultural identities.

Besides, one of the most notable aspects of the process was the resources the participants actively utilized to negotiate their identities, resources that Holland et al. (1998) termed cultural artifacts. Remarkably, these artifacts were the teaching work of the teachers themselves; teaching practices were the personalized tools to manage their own sociocultural identities. This means that each teacher individually and voluntarily adopted/adapted certain practices as a device for self-authoring. Meanwhile, a practice was not an all-purpose tool for the teacher's comprehensive sociocultural understandings; rather, it was related to specific points of their identities—understanding of students or self-

understanding regarding social class, race, difference, multiculturalism, culture, nationality, etc. Therefore, instead of presenting overall practices, I will highlight particular scenes of teaching that conclusively show how the negotiation process leads to a distinct understanding. Hence, this chapter will demonstrate how each teacher mediated their identities through their teaching practices.

Each participant-teacher is allotted one section. Before presenting findings on the participants' teaching practice, I provide a snapshot of their classrooms and daily routines. The visual description will offer readers a full image of the context for the teacher's practice.

SAE-RA

The Classroom and Her Day at School

When I opened the back door to Sae-Ra's classroom, I saw 23 students sitting on their chairs and Sae-Ra standing in front of the classroom, a rectangular space of about 725 square feet. Students' seats were divided into three sections, and each section had four rows of two students' personal desks and chairs. She assigned students' seats in consideration of their academic level, physique, and personality and changed the seats once in a while. On the front wall, a large blackboard took up considerable space in the middle. At the beginning of each lesson, she wrote a date and the lesson topic on the board, but except for this information, she rarely wrote on the board. At the left corner of the board, six cards with group numbers were posted, and below the cards, there were a bunch of colorful magnets. On the left side of the board, 23 student photos, one of each student, were displayed, and there was a poster, which was a kind of behavior chart. On the right side of

the board, an artfully written slogan was posted: “we love to be together and are considerate of each other.”

On the left front side of the ceiling hung a large TV screen. The screen was turned on during most of the lessons, showing PPT slides, movie clips, and pictures of textbooks. Under the TV, there was a space for the teacher with a large desk and a chair. Beside a computer and a printer on the desk, a pile of students’ diaries awaiting the teacher’s comments were found every time I visited. A small bell rung to draw the students’ attention and a stamp carved with the phrase ‘Good job, teacher Sae-Ra,’ were on the desk. Just next to the teacher’s desk, a student’s desk was placed as a seat for a misbehaving student in order to give a warning. On the back wall, there was a large, decorative posterboard for school announcements and displays of students’ learning results such as pictures, crafts, or essays. Large windows were on the left side wall of the classroom and half of one window was blocked with a behavior chart. All of the walls were neatly decorated with the students’ crafts. Each craft was accentuated on a tidy background with a student’s name that Sae-Ra skillfully made or beautifully handwrote.

School started at 8:30, and the first 30 minutes was dedicated to warming up for the day. During this time, Sae-Ra had a meeting with other teachers in the same grade or read students’ diaries and wrote comments on them, but mostly she spent time preparing lessons for that day while students read books, had a storytelling by a volunteer-parent, or watched school broadcasting. She had four to five lessons for three subjects each day as a 2nd grade teacher: Korean language arts, Mathematics, and Integrated Subjects. The lessons started at 9 am and lasted for 40 minutes; then, there was a break for ten minutes between each lesson. The schedule was kept by the sound of a bell ringing throughout the school. During lesson time, when students worked on a task like writing or reading by themselves, she sat

at her desk and looked at the computer monitor, scanned a textbook or a teacher's handbook, or wrote comments on students' diaries.

During the breaks, she was surrounded by many students who engaged with her in a silly or mischievous way. For instance, students voluntarily massaged her arms and shoulders, or she was pushed here and there by some other students who played under her desk. At the end of the last lesson, she wrote a class note on the computer and let students copy it in their notebooks from the TV. She checked each notebook in order to make sure that every student exactly wrote the entire note down. Then, she commanded students to clean their own seat with a small personal mop and pack their bags while she played the song '*The 100 great Korean historical figure*s.' When the classroom was cleaned up around noon, Sae-Ra said "bye"; then, she and all of the students answered "I love you" by making a heart with their hands and putting it on their heads. She exited the classroom and led a line of students to the cafeteria. About 20-30 minutes later, she came back to the classroom after having lunch, dealt with her paper work or school tasks, and instructed a class of gifted students. She left the school after 4:30 pm.

In the previous chapter, I already noted that Sae-Ra undoubtedly identified herself as a competent person due to her outstanding academic achievement and elite social background; further, she held a hierarchical perception of others based on their sociocultural status as well as a hostility toward the multicultural population for the same reason. This section shows us that she solidified this sociocultural identity as she focused on some specific aspects in her teaching. Meanwhile, whenever she encountered contradictions between her various understandings or between herself and others, she orchestrated them throughout her practices by applying her identity separately or even hiding it.

Preserving a Superior Identity By Pursuing a Competent Teacher-Identity

As a 2nd grade teacher, Sae-Ra enthusiastically worked with young students. For example, she let students tramp all over the classroom for a measuring activity in Math (2nd observation), conducted various station activities for the Integrated Subject with a lot of advance preparation (3rd interview and 4th observation), taught jumping rope on a hot day at the end of June (3rd interview), and made six sets of bottle xylophones for only a 10 minute-break activity (5th observation). Besides these lively and engaging activities, Sae-Ra developed a close and casual relationship with most of the students. She affectionately treated the students with love and interacted with them in kind. During the breaks, she wholeheartedly embraced very noisy and energetic, or even silly and mischievous behaviors of students, just as if she were one of their friends.

These energetic practices seemed originally driven by her aspirations to match herself with her image of a good teacher. For instance, Sae-Ra explained the reason that she seldom missed out on providing students with interesting materials to work on each lesson: she felt herself to be a good teacher when she saw students having fun with the materials (4th interview). In addition, the enthusiastic work described above also corresponded to the ideal teacher she defined; "a teacher who helps students learn with fun, provides them enough materials, and plays games with them" and "a teacher who makes students happy to come to school" (4th interview). Therefore, Sae-Ra, who had been acknowledged as a competent person performing at a superior level, seemed to want to preserve this identity in her work as well.

Remarkably, this intention, through which she tried to distinguish herself from incompetent teachers, was clearly revealed through her passion for test scores. She used students' test scores as a resource to author her identity as a competent teacher. The quote

below reveals why she was very concerned about testing,[26] even though she taught 2nd grade, which generally places little importance on test scores.

> *I think I have a desire, a desire regarding test scores that my class should not perform poorly compared to other classes in 2nd grade. Due to this concern, I push students and drill them for the test. I know it is not important, but I cannot stop. There is no one who puts pressure on me about the scores. No one pushes me, but you know, if my class does badly on a test, the results reveal only two possibilities: one is that the students are stupid, and the other is that I do not teach well. That is the reason. I do not want to have that kind of reputation. Of course, I know teaching diligently throughout the semester is important. Yet, what others see is the scores. So, I come to focus only on the results. (4th interview)*

In order to verify her excellence and competence over other incompetent teachers, she took students' test scores for a significant indicator of her superior teacher identity, just as she derived a similar self-understanding from test scores during her school years. Therefore, she was eager to push students to get a good score. Apart from unofficial tests on each unit, Sae-Ra also intensively kept providing preliminary tests near the official test date, scheduled for June 28th. On June 20th, I saw a bunch of preliminary test papers; when I observed on June 25th, there was another set. One day, she was grading a preliminary test at a break time and many students surrounded her and looked at their friends′ scores. Yet, Sae-Ra did not care about their presence; instead, she repeatedly called each student's name with an announcement of the test score. "Whose paper is it? Oh, Kwon! Score 70! You

[26]For the 2nd grade in South Korea, students take a test only in Korean language arts and Mathematics once at the end of each semester. The results of these tests at the primary grade level do not bring any serious consequences or effects because the original purpose of the test is no more than reference data for a teacher. Yet, in reality, each class's score is usually reported to fellow teachers and to the administration, so it may be an undeniable fact that teachers care somewhat about being compared to other classes. However, Sae-Ra's anxiety over the test seemed very serious compared to other participant teachers.

shouldn't get this score again. Ji-Min, 95! Good job, Ji-Min" (5th observation). The day before the test, there were also many stacks of preliminary test papers on her desk. When my eyes lingered on the stacks, she said,

> *The test is tomorrow, so I let them work on that a lot. (Laugh) I made them practice so hard. … I know I shouldn't act like this. Yet, you know, I'll be so worried about the score without these practices. At least, I have to get a similar score to other classes. If the score were at the very bottom of this grade, I would think that I am not good at teaching. Actually, my class last year did poorly, so if is the results are similar this year, I would get too stressed. (3rd interview)*

Sae-Ra placed a high value on students' test scores as if they represented her competence, so she tried to avoid a low score and sought a good result. That is, this practice reflected her own decision to secure her superior and competent identity by/in her profession, and the test score was a tool she assigned to reaffirm that identity.

Embodying Hierarchical Understanding By Promoting Stratified Images of Students

The most distinctive aspect that attracted my attention during six observations in Sae-Ra's class was a disciplinary system, operating on three levels: the whole class, groups, and individual students. First, there was a poster, displayed on the front wall, with 23 circles, which worked for the whole class. Sae-Ra stamped the poster when every student performed or behaved well altogether. In the middle of June, for the first time in three and a half months, she rewarded the class with a movie and ice-cream for all students because the poster was filled with 23 stamps. Another was a group chart on the blackboard. When she complimented a group of three to four students, i.e., the first group to pay attention to

the teacher after a group activity, she put a colored magnet next to the group number. At the end of every day, each student in the group that had earned the most magnets received a candy or a vitamin gummy. If there were more than one group with the highest number of magnets, Sae-Ra let them do rock-paper-scissors to determine which group would earn the reward.

These two disciplinary devices were actively used in the class. Yet, there was one more, which became the most tightly interwoven with the class dynamic. It was a behavior chart, marked for individual students. It had four cells with an icon for each: from top to bottom. They were a gorilla, an anthropoid ape, a primitive man, and a modern human. Every day, each student's number button was placed on the cell of anthropoid ape, the second cell from the bottom. If a student participated or responded to the teacher's questions three times that day, the student could move his/her number-button to upper cell on the chart. In addition, when the student got a compliment from Sae-Ra, the button could move up again and reach the top cell, "Human." The button could be moved only when she specifically identified a compliment as a credit: "Here you go – a *praise*[27]." At the same time, when the student received a warning from Sae-Ra, the button would be moved down. If a student ended the day on the Gorilla cell, he/she had to sweep the classroom. In contrast, a student who reached the Human cell over the course of the day could earn a stamp on a personal reward board, which had 30 empty cells. If the personal cells on the board were filled up with stamps, the student became an honor student. The honor student could pick up a coupon for a reward, such as exemption from homework or a preparatory test, eating lunch first, and choosing a peer to sit next to. Sae-Ra also took a picture of the

[27]She said she awarded 'praise' if a student replied with a very creative or correct answer while no one else had an idea; she also gave it to a student who had outstanding behavior, such as helping friends. (4th interview)

student and posted it on the class homepage. During the first semester, 8 students among a total of 23 were appointed as honor students.

Even though this chart projected dehumanizing images (Bartolome, 1994; Brown, 2013), Sae-Ra neither was aware of its problematic implications nor cared about the effects at all. Rather, she indifferently explained the reason for adopting the chart: the pictures were created by a popular teacher on a teacher community website (2nd interview). However, the chart distinctly seemed like the crux of the overall class management, including lesson time. Not only did Sae-Ra consistently mention and use it, but the students also seemed to be bound to the system. They were sensitive to the button's movement and appreciated the 'praise' that would earn them a higher place on the chart more than any applause or complimentary words from the teacher.[28]

Notably, certain students' number-buttons remained statically on one extreme end of the chart, Human or Gorilla, throughout the semester. In turn, several students became firmly associated with the specific images of a human or a gorilla; furthermore, other students in the class embraced these images as static. While a student cried out that "I became Human today," some students pointed out whose button should move down and yelled to inform the teacher of who was a Gorilla. One day, several students even questioned Sae-Ra in doubt that "how come he became 'Human'? How can he be 'Human'?" (4th interview).

However, Sae-Ra did not worry about this stratification among students, which was visualized by the four-level chart; rather, she intentionally strengthened the perception by utilizing the chart. For instance, during a 40-minute Korean Language Arts lesson, Sae-Ra

[28]Based on this description of the elaborate disciplinary system, the reader may wonder how the class had the relaxed atmosphere I described at the beginning of this section. It was certainly surprising that the overall mood of the classroom was pretty free and unregulated instead of a stultifying atmosphere even though Sae-Ra employed these teacher-centered controlling systems. Yet, the atmosphere might be easily explained by her desire to identify herself as a good teacher "who makes students happy" (4th interview). In turn, it became clear that Sae-Ra did not adopt the disciplinary systems to foster a rigid class atmosphere.

appointed a female student to present seven times and gave her two "praises" while she repeatedly gave warnings to other specific students. There were three students who were always placed at the bottom cell. I often noticed that Sae-Ra publically referred to those students as Gorillas; "You are a Gorilla today" (2nd observation). When two of the three students crashed into each other and cried in the morning, she instantly concluded it was because of their mischief and got angry at them prior to figuring out what had happened (3rd interview). Later, she found it was just an accident, but passed it over. Jeong-Woo, a multicultural student, was one of the three at the bottom rung. When there was a fight between Jeong-Woo and a female student, Sae-Ra only rebuked him without investigating the incident while saying, "unconditionally, it would be his fault" (2nd interview). Moreover, one day, when one of the three students filled the personal reward board with stamps, she invalidated his achievement in front of the entire class.

> *I've been suspicious him. I think he made three presentations, but he never showed good behaviors that warranted 'Human.' Today, I scolded him. Even though there are some students who behave as 'Human', but can't reach the top; yet, he usually puts his button on the top. I couldn't believe it because he always got many warnings. Upon any consideration, I couldn't agree that how he got all these stamps in spite of his bad behaviors. Then, he was 'Human' again today, so I counted all the praises and warnings. After all, he was not 'Human' but just placed the button on the top himself. I said, 'Hey, you are not Human!,' and I gave the board back him. I had calculated exactly. (Laugh) (4th interview)*

Regardless of whether or not the student had cheated, it seemed certain that her treatment solidified the student's low position in the class. However, she showed a very contrary response to the Human group students. Even when I cautiously reported to Sae-Ra a scene I had observed in which a female student of the group was mean to her peers,

she showed trust in the student: "her mom is a principal of a preschool. … I don't think she is selfish. She just loves to get attention. If she bullied her friends, I would know; yet, I do not know. (Thus,) she is not bullying them." (3rd interview). In addition, her discriminatory practice prominently came up during my 4th observation. She went back on her word with one of the three identified as Gorilla when she selected student-helpers for station activities.

> *Many students raised hands, so I let them do rock-paper-scissors. Then, he won. (Laugh) However, I thought I should not entrust him with the task. So, I let the other two students[29] be the helpers. Yeah, although he won, I let the two students replace him as saying the helpers should be students who are calm. (Laugh) I believed he should never do that. He was very sad about that, but.... Actually, students raised their hands without knowing what they were gonna do. When I just asked, "who wants to help the teacher?', students thoughtlessly raised their hands. However, you know, participation in the activity is much more fun than serving as helpers. Anyway, even if I appointed him, I bet he would just wander around. (Laugh) I prevented a bad situation in advance (Laugh) (3rd interview).*

Sae-Ra did not even give the student an excuse, but unilaterally notified him that he would not be chosen. Moreover, she was not even aware of her behavior as discriminatory. She explained her decision to me as deserved treatment, whereas she gave 'praise' to the two students who served as helpers after the activity.

As these cases show, it was evident that the stratification of students was strengthened by Sae-Ra's own decision, especially in the case of the disdainful image of the three 'Gorilla' students. What should be noted here is that her different attitude toward the two groups was mostly irrelevant to the students' actual behaviors. That is, I was able to consistently find her treating some students in a dismissive fashion regardless of whether they had actually committed problematic behaviors similar to how hypervisibility works in

[29]The two students were often found in the Human cell, and both were honor students in the class.

teachers' disciplinary practices toward African American male students (Ferguson, 2001; Howard, 1999). Then, it may be inferred that Sae-Ra's practice might be based on an understanding of the students as deviant. At this point, interestingly, I could not help but point out that the division between the two groups corresponded to their seeming family SES background. The Human students had secure family conditions, whereas the three lowest-ranking students came from a family background that is commonly regarded as unprivileged. One student with ADHD was a child being raised by a grandmother without parents; another one, from a low-income family, received inconsistent attention from his "abnormal mother" (2nd interview); and the last one, Jeong-Woo, was a child of a Filipino woman.

Therefore, Sae-Ra's discriminatory practices and the stratified images of the students might be explained by her strong hierarchical ranking of people according to their social capital. Even though the perception could be formed by the larger societal discourse, the practice shows how she actively recreated a hierarchical space in her classroom rather than simply complying with it. In other words, the disciplinary chart seemed like a substantial resource through which she put her hierarchical orientation into practice. Thus, this actualization through the chart was the way Sae-Ra reaffirmed her understanding. This explanation makes sense of why she was only concerned about any possibility that the students might deceive her and move to the upper cells, instead of being equally worried about dehumanization or stratification when I asked about the drawbacks of the system (4th interview).

In addition, although she did not create a strict vibe in her class overall, she developed strained relations with these three students because of her cold and disapproving treatment of them. This practice was very contradictory to her ideal image of a good teacher. Yet, she skillfully avoided this contradiction in herself by excluding the three

students from the boundaries of her competent teacher-identity who is "kind" and "fun" (4th interview).

> *I hope to make those students submissive. I mean the (three) students; the others are fine and concentrate on the lesson well. So, I will control them. I think I will be better if they become more controllable. The others are fine, so I will only work on them and let them be calm. Then, they will be easy to manage (4th interview).*

By treating them as fundamentally different from the other students, she could deal with them in a prescriptive and strict way. Therefore, she could promote her hierarchical orientation based on people's sociocultural background while simultaneously preserving her ideal teacher-identity with the other students. That was how she mediated between the two threads of her sociocultural understanding.

Retaining Anti-Multicultural Understanding By Hiding Behind the Curriculum

On the day of my second observation, Sae-Ra began teaching a new unit, 'Diverse Families,' which was developed in 20 lessons focusing on multicultural families in South Korea according to the national Integrated Subjects curriculum of 2009. I very attentively observed how she would teach the unit because she already plainly revealed her hostility toward the multicultural population during the first interview. However, contrary to what I had heard from her, Sae-Ra seemingly did not express any of her negative thoughts or emotions toward multicultural people during the few lessons of the unit. Rather, she presented the multicultural family as a non-abnormal family and emphasized the students' tolerance toward them exactly according to the textbook description.[30] For example, in the

[30]However, the way of presenting the multicultural family in the textbook regretfully indicated that the family with non-Korean parents were the Others (S-Y Kim, 2013).

introductory lesson of the unit, when she talked about different cultural practices and language disfluency of a foreigner in a story from the textbook, Sae-Ra developed the discussion according to the example in the teacher handbook. She threw out questions from the stance of cultural relativism: "do you think eating with one's fingers is wrong?", "well, why isn't he fluent in Korean? If we speak English in overseas countries, might they feel the same way that we are not fluent in English?" (2nd observation).

Nevertheless, she did not actively manage that discussion so that the students could truly internalize the values. She responded to students' answers with simple agreement, repeatedly saying, "really?" or "is that so?" (2nd observation). I was not able to find any sincerity in opening up the multicultural-friendly discussion. Instead, from her waffling attitude, I could be sure that she had not assimilated the message of tolerance in the textbook into her own understanding; instead, she just withheld her negative understanding of multicultural people. This withholding was identified again in the following lesson. She mentioned five various family pictures in the textbook, then she questioned students about the commonality and difference between the families, i.e., the single-parent family and grandparent family, including the multicultural family. Finally, the lesson ended with the questions below.

Sae-Ra: This is the most important question. If the form of the family is different, is it still a family? If it is different from yours, can you say it is not a family?
Students: No.
Sae-Ra: They are all families. Please open your notebook.
(She wrote three sentences on the blackboard and students copied them in their notebooks: "Do not discriminate, Acknowledge differences, Be considerate")
Sae-Ra: (while writing) Don't bully, Just accept people for who they are. I'm asking you a final question. There are various forms of family and if you keep these three guidelines, what would be beneficial?

Students: We can get along well with them; we can be familiar with them; it helps others' hearts not to be hurt.
Sae-Ra: Then, can you guys keep the three rules?
Students: Yes
Sae-Ra: Please read them aloud.

At this time again, she delivered to the students what the teacher handbook suggested as the correct answers. Thus, apparently, she seemed to stand on the multicultural-friendly side. Yet, as before, she did not lead a substantial discussion for students to embrace the conclusions; instead, Sae-Ra hastily glossed over the values in a value-free way. This contradictory practice was repeatedly observed; during lessons, she never voiced the strong opinions revealed in her interviews and she presented the multicultural-friendly instruction, but she made do with only skin-deep discussion. In the meantime, when I wondered about the inconsistency between the surface and depth of her lessons, she voluntarily explained a reason for the gap. While she plainly stated about the understanding of foreigners' harmful effect on Korean society in an interview conducted after these two lessons, she continued her talk.

So, I don't like multicultural change. Yet, the textbook is written in a way that we should like them; or acknowledge them rather than like them. It teaches us to acknowledge them as human. (So, I have to teach in that way.) (2nd interview)

By then, the difference between her thoughts and practice came across. Sae-Ra's practice, which contrasted with her multicultural understanding, happened because she hid her own frank opinions behind the curriculum. Since she was already aware that her thoughts were "full of prejudice and bias," she was concerned about being criticized when publically revealing them in class (3rd interview). For this reason, she buried her thoughts

instead of exposing them and so avoided facing any disputes or criticism. Therefore, with the textbook as a shield, she, who wished to maintain the image of a good teacher, sheltered her anti-multicultural understanding. In addition, that practice might be also possible since a teacher who faithfully follows the textbook was compatible with her ideal of a good teacher in the school culture of South Korea, which took for granted that teachers would follow the textbook page by page at each lesson.

However, she did not completely hide her negative understanding. As she moved onto the later lessons, which involved more actual activities dependent on the teacher rather than the textbook or the lessons, which dealt with the seemingly non-affective domain, she became less defensive and revealed her thoughts carelessly. A lesson designed to visit or investigate an actual multicultural family and its culture showed an instance of this revealing behavior. She asked Jeong-Woo, the only multicultural student in the class, to let the class know about his multicultural background in order to objectify his family for the lesson. Yet, he refused her request because "he did not want to be thought of as a multicultural student" (2nd interview) although many classmates already knew his family background. Then, in place of a multicultural family in reality, she showed an animation about a multicultural family for the entire lesson time. The movie was also about a Filipino-Korean child like him. The child in the movie, who was ashamed of his multicultural background before, recovered his self-confidence, so he came to get along with other students and to love his Filipino mother. The movie focused on the dispirited child and his tense relationship with his mother; moreover, it described him as one causing the relational problems. Sae-Ra said she selected it due to another teacher's recommendation on a website, so she might not have known the whole story in advance. However, even after she showed the movie, she did not consider the feelings of Jeong-Woo, who might be

uncomfortable with another Filipino-Korean boy on the screen. Rather, she wondered why I asked about his emotions and indifferently said;

> *(He was okay because) Jeong-Woo could not identify with the boy in the movie because his mom has left home and won't come back (but the child in the movie has his mom) (2nd interview).*

In addition, her investment in normality and assimilation was also exposed during the final lesson of the unit. For the lesson wrapping up the whole unit, she implemented station activities as the textbook suggested. Yet, instead of a cooking station, she added a few more stations. For one of them, she intended to show a clip from a TV program. She told me the reason for selecting this clip:

> *There was an episode of A Prince of Congo. They were a royal family, but they escaped and took refuge in our country. They really speak Korean well and live as exactly like Korean" (3rd interview).*

Although she eventually did not show the clip due to running out of time, the lesson plan was enough to show us what she had in mind as a desirable state for multicultural people. These episodes, along with her interviews, made clear that Sae-Ra did not simply follow the multiculturalism in the curriculum. Instead, she handled the frame to retain her multicultural understanding. Hiding her mindset under the curriculum was a strategy she adopted in order to shun possible conflict within herself as well as to secure her own multicultural understanding.

DO-JIN

The Classroom and His Day at School

The music classroom was one of the unoccupied, ordinary classrooms with rows of students' personal desks and chairs. Positioned front and center, there was a large desk and a chair for a teacher. On the desk, a monitor, a printer, a pair of speakers, and a recorder were found. On the right side of the teacher's desk, there was a *Janggu*, a Korean traditional percussion instrument, on its own stand; on the left side, a keyboard instrument was laid on an extra student's desk. Next to the keyboard, a large TV stood. Behind the desk against the wall, there was a large blackboard. The board was blank most of the time, but Do-Jin used a white board, which was positioned in the middle of the board. The classroom felt empty because the other walls were not decorated. Except for the two instruments, it was hard to tell that this was a music classroom. Only once at the end of the semester, when Do-Jin opened his lesson to other teachers for teacher evaluation, did he put some musical articles and students' reports on the back board.

He conducted 16 music lessons per week, and on Wednesday, he had no classes. He taught 8 classes from 3rd -5th grade and had two lessons a week for each class. Except during the lesson time, he usually stayed in the school office with the vice principal due to his position as director of school affairs. He came to his office by 8:30 in the morning, where he composed an announcement for teachers and handled official documents or other duties. When it was around class time, he went to the music classroom.

Usually a song in the textbook was taught within two lessons. Every lesson started with a certain routine. As soon as the students came and had taken their seats, Do-Jin made them play the recorders. When he played the recorder for the last piece of a song, students played by following him. While students were playing, he played along, sang sol-fa, or

directed. After playing three songs with the recorders, students were guided to sing songs according to an accompaniment playing from a computer. Sometimes he played the guitar instead of clicking the music files. Students sang a variety of songs, from a children's song to pop music. After singing three to four songs, the warm up was done. Moving onto the song for the lesson, Do-Jin guided students to read the rhythm. Once they could fluently read the rhythm of the song, he let them sing. To teach melody, he made them repeat each part of the recorded song from an instructional website. When students mastered the song, he appointed two or three students to sing a solo. Alternatively, at the end of the lesson he showed a musical movie. In the case of 4th and 5th grades, he had students perform a quick rhythm test in their notebooks before wrapping up the class. He had three to five lessons a day, each for 40 minutes. After the last lesson, he again came back to the office and handled other official work.

The life history in Chapter Five already narrated how Do-Jin eagerly navigated his life toward social success. In addition, the life path was finally construed when his belief in socio-cultural and economic capital was clearly revealed in the following piece; the strong hierarchical social system in South Korea would be unchangeable, and the capital is a crucial resource to achieve social mobility in the given system. It seems his trust in the capital did not sound very different from the dominant notion in society; however, he went a step further and aggressively expanded the thought to his teaching practice. At the same time, Do-Jin was not only absorbed in his personal or family success. Within his Christian beliefs, he understood himself as "altruistic" and wanted to contribute to others' success as well (4th interview). Hence, he showed a high interest in banking cultural capital in his students for their future success. That is, Do-Jin, a music teacher, interpreted his teaching profession within this orientation, so he actively utilized his teaching to let his students

obtain cultural capital for their success. In addition, he consolidated his deficit thinking on the students from low SES background as providing cultural capital for them.

Solidifying His Belief in Cultural Capital By Focusing on Students' Achievement

Regarding his internalized belief in the capital, Do-Jin considered academic achievement as the most powerful cultural capital that would promise one's success in South Korean society. It explains why he was extremely enthusiastic about his daughter's academic development. For this reason, he, who identified himself as other-oriented, defined teaching as "the work of uplifting students" (4th interview) and thought the elevation could happen only when students learn and achieve something. He even developed the thought that "it is only true teaching when it generates students' development and learning" (3rd interview). Consequently, it was no wonder that he highly emphasized students' learning above any other aspects of the lesson as potential capital.

Assessment is a clear example of his obsession with cultural capital. He openly gave instant and individual feedback on students' performance: "You were wrong" (2nd observation), "Your voice was unstable on that note," "You opened your mouth widely, good job" (3rd observation), "I found you guys making mistakes," "You failed", "You did great only on this part" (4th observation), and "You missed the beats" (5th observation). Even if the direct feedback might generate some improvement in students, the harsh evaluation by sharply pointing out personal performance might also hurt students' feelings. Yet, it seemed he focused too much on students' improvement to care about their emotions. Even more, when there was a performance evaluation, he evaluated students' singing while he presented the grade sheet on the screen. He graded and wrote descriptive evaluations on the sheet as every student watched. This public evaluation was also intended to improve students' musical performance.

Showing the grade has both a good effect and a bad effect. It seems students who got a C grade become uncomfortable. Boys are fine, but girls sometimes have a hard time due to the visible grade. Yet, the good thing is making students know their objective ability and skill. I think students also need to have an objective perception of themselves to be developed. They may realize what they are lacking as they watch the screen. Also, by viewing their peers' grades and feedback, they can increase their musical knowledge and musical eye. (3rd interview)

Although he was somewhat concerned about students' emotions, Do-Jin prioritized students' learning to their feelings because he believed open grading would eventually lead to students' achievement, which would turn into capital for their future success. Thus, it was evident that the evaluation practice, emphasizing achievement, resulted from the value he placed in cultural capital. Yet, conversely, as he saw students' improvement through his feedback, he also strengthened his trust in achievement as capital: "(after direct assessment,) when students change and feel the difference, I find the value in teaching. Oh, I can improve students" (3rd interview). Therefore, he could persist in evaluating practice as a way to support his understanding of cultural capital and success.

Beyond the assessment, he even actively selected content to teach in order to make students earn the most crucial musical capital: rhythm. He identified the essence of music learning as two key skills: "becoming comfortable with sheet music" and "interpreting sheet music" (4th interview). Then, he pointed to rhythm as the foundation of sheet music, so he excessively highlighted the learning of rhythm in his lesson; he even defined teaching rhythm as "the authentic education" (4th interview).

Actually, I teach what I think is important regardless of the official curriculum. Music has freedom from the curriculum (because there is no subject test in Music). I teach what is the most necessary and useful for the

students and their future life. They should utilize at least one aspect of what they have learned from my lesson, which, as I see it, is rhythm. … Most of all, if you become good at rhythm, you can quickly learn a new song. For example, if you are around 4th grade, you can play a new song with a recorder. I think the ability to read sheet music (sight reading) is most important. (2nd interview)

He regarded teaching rhythm as banking capital for his students, which is most beneficial to be successful in music. Thus, Do-Jin actually spent little time during the lesson on teaching the curricular songs, but devoted a considerable amount on teaching rhythm. He put a significant amount of time into playing the recorder and singing some songs that were not part of the curriculum, but were very rhythmical. This rhythm-focused teaching was neither required by curricular structure nor by school policy. Instead, it was completely his decision based on his personal musical experience, which consisted of his own musical insight and his trust in cultural capital. His excessive focus on rhythm was so great that he was relatively less sensitive to other issues. For example, in the 4th observation, although there was a student getting into mischief, Do-Jin did not warn him to stop misbehaving. When I asked about the student, he answered as follows.

Um, actually I kept looking at the students' mouths. Even though he is doing something else or not sitting calmly, if he moves his lips, it means that he is enjoying the rhythm. It may be his way of enjoying the song. In that case, I don't need to scold him because he is falling into the beat. (3rd interview)

Do-Jin was unmindful of the student's improper behavior as long as he was learning the rhythm. He only focused on the student's improvement in rhythm and overlooked the other negative side effects. There was another instance that underlines Do-Jin's rhythm-focused practice: one of the songs students repeatedly sang at the beginning of each lesson was a Korean pop song that he had chosen for the class. I had not known the song before,

but I was a little bit shocked when I first heard students singing the song in the lesson, as it contained provocative lyrics for 3rd grade students. Surprisingly, he was also aware of this problem, but he kept using it with the purpose to let them master a complicated rhythm.

> *When I selected the song, "Heartbreaker," I was in a state of ambivalence, and I felt something was wrong. When I sing it with students, I feel strange, too. I expected the song might cause some problems. Yet, I am teaching the song because of the rhythm. If students can sing this rhythmical song, then they can sing other difficult songs. … That is why I chose this song. (3rd interview)*

He authorized rhythm as valuable musical capital, which is "ultimately helpful for the future" (4th interview) and prioritized teaching rhythm over the ethical issue of the song's inappropriate lyrics. Do-Jin's voluntary and insistent use of the song suggests that he not only practiced according to his understanding that cultural capital is essential for success, but also convinced himself of it. Later, even when he encountered an obstacle, he did not turn away from his original purpose. Only when he directly faced a parent's complaint about the song did he start looking for an alternative song with reluctance. Yet, at that time he still considered rhythm above all.

> *One day, one of my students told me that his parents had prohibited him from singing the song, so I simply told him not sing the song alone. Later, I met his mother by chance and talked about the song. She told me that she was so shocked by some of its lyrics. So, I explained that I think the song has very good rhythm. Yet, I am looking for a more wholesome song to replace it. However, it's rare to find a song as rhythmical as that one. (4th interview)*

Placing a high value on students' achievement, Do-Jin consistently paid attention to students' achievement of rhythmic sense. As he tightly clung to the notion that rhythm

is the most useful aspect of music learning, he more firmly laid the foundation of his trust in the importance of cultural capital for success in the current system. In other words, through rhythm-focused teaching, he solidified his understanding of achievement-capital.

Assuring Deficit Thinking By Supplying the Lack in Students

While he endorsed the teaching of rhythm, he diagnosed that his students were not able to have success in rhythmic achievement because they lacked intellectual capital, which is necessary to learn something. This thought had been solidly constructed throughout the four years he had worked at Sprout Elementary School. Since he served as a director teacher, he could reach a more comprehensive and detail understanding of its community circumstances and students' family background. With all this information, he concluded that the students were from working class and insecure family conditions. Then, he viewed his students as inherently deficient based on his very deep-seated belief in class stereotypes, mentioned in Chapter Five. Moreover, he came to reconfirm this understanding again during the past year when he taught the students English as a foreign language. Before that year, he was a teacher of Moral Education at the school, a subject that rarely deals with intellectual knowledge, so he did not encounter any serious issues regarding the students' low achievement. However, during the year of teaching English, he was very shocked by the students' performance[31], and then he immediately made sense of his observation as a matter of the "poor intelligence" of "the students of this school" (1st

[31]The 2007 curriculum set a standard of writing a sentence for 6th graders and a standard of listening to and speaking a past-tense sentence for 5th graders. Yet, Do-Jin demanded that they exceed these standards: "*I was so stressed. Let me say, there are only less than half of the students among 4th graders who could write a sentence, 'what is your name?'. You know what, in 5th grade, students should be able to write past tense sentences, so how could I stand for them? Even though the official curriculum set a very easy standard, in this contemporary world, isn't it reasonable to perform more?*" (2nd interview)

interview). Since the students were dominantly from poor conditions, Do-Jin directly linked their low achievement to their low SES background.

> *Low achievement is a common feature of poor people. And, although they receive many supportive programs, they do not get away from low achievement. You know, after all, it is not that schools do not teach. We teach, but they need to repeat. I think I have to teach the rhythm syllables for one or two months. For one set of note-syllables, they need a month and for two, two months. They do not learn well although I teach. They have a bad memory and all the other features of low-achieving students. (2nd interview)*

Therefore, in order to make students master rhythm, Do-Jin adopted a cramming method to substitute for their inherent intellectual deficiency. He taught four kinds of notes and their syllables[32] since the beginning of this semester: half notes, quarter notes, eighth note pairs, and dotted quarter notes and eighth notes. For three months, he repeated them and let students take tests to match notes and syllables. Then, he ordered students who missed any one of the pairs to write it five times more.

> *I've repeatedly let the 4th and 5th graders write down the four pairs of rhythm syllables and notes. I asked them to memorize them, but they do not do well. I've tested the students for three weeks. There are only four pairs to memorize, no, actually it can be said two pairs. Yet, it takes more than three weeks. This is because they don't have any basic concept of a note, even of a quarter note, needless to say about an eighth note. Because they never have any sense of the length of the note, the lesson is absolutely a kind of alien language for them. So, if there is only one way to memorize a foreign language, it is through repetition. They don't even know how to draw a note. Even though I taught and showed them, they don't do well because they are not prepared even with a semblance of readiness. So, they take longer to learn one thing. It is a kind of situation where they learn the word "name",*

[32]Each note is assigned specific syllables that express its duration. For example, you may read a quarter note as *ta*, an eighth note pair as *ti-ti*, and a half note as *ta-a*.

but do not know what "n" is. Thus, there is no way except repetition. When I taught these student at first, I felt something like rejection or a resistance to learning. After I have observed them closely, I found that they do not have any basic foundation. "Ok, then no way but." I let them repeatedly draw a quarter note. Finally, I think half of the students have memorized it. (2nd interview)

Because sight reading was the ultimate goal of his teaching, he repeatedly taught students how to read rhythm. Yet, in fact, based on his deficit thinking he assumed in advance that it would be "impossible at the level of this school" to accomplish sight reading (3rd interview). It seemed he thought he could not overcome their intellectual deficiency. However, around the end of the semester, students were able to read the rhythm of a new song and even came to sing or play the song with a recorder when Do-Jin partially guided them. The learners, who performed poorly in English last year, finally showed successful achievement in Music this year. Specifically, when there was an open class, observed by a principal and other fellow teachers just at the end of the semester, the lesson went well and the students showed a good performance. The observers were also very amazed by the students' performance, which exceeded their expectations. They expressed their surprise with comments such as, "wow, is it possible at this school?" and "I didn't know that these students can do it" (4th interview).

In spite of other teachers' comments, Do-Jin did not attribute the achievement to the students' ability. Instead, he still doubted the students' intelligence and thought that the success was "possible" because of his own musical talent and insight (4th interview). As he compared this achievement to his experience teaching English, in which he was less well versed, he concluded that his insights about music could overcome students' intellectual deficiency. Based on these conclusions, he planned to maintain his teaching approach with deficit thinking.

I think the choice to give a rhythm test was really good and helpful. If I didn't do that, I would definitely regret it. … For next semester, I will keep working on rhythm. This semester focused on four-four time, but next semester, it will be six-eight time. Actually it is much easier than the common time. Yet, I'm not sure whether the students can memorize that rhythm. Look at how long they took to memorize the rhythm this semester (4th interview).

It was Do-Jin who held fast to the notion of his students' inevitable failure even when faced with direct evidence of their achievement. He did not leave room for questioning the deficit thinking. Instead, he chose to implement a repetitive method of instruction again next semester. Rather, he seemed to confirm the perception through this practice.

Along with his views on the students' intellectual deficiency, Do-Jin understood they were also culturally deficient. Thus, he singled out a rich cultural experience, such as "high-level culture," to replenish the students' deficiency.

Also, without being exposed to high-level culture in school, they might never hear anything and would spend their whole lives singing only Teuroteu[33]. So, I think it is better to provide them with that kind of experience, such as classical and high-level culture. (4th interview)

Do-Jin understood there might be no other chance for them to bank cultural capital, which would be absolutely needed for a successful future, so he intended to compensate for what they lacked in musical refinement. He did so through movies that significantly popular classical music. At the end of each lesson, he screened a film, such as *Life is Beautiful*, *The Sound of Music*, *The Classic*, and a parody of *Les Misérable*s. Or sometimes,

[33]This is a genre of Korean pop music that has existed since the early 1900s. The most common sense of this genre is that it is low-brow entertainment for the masses.

he allotted the full lesson time to a movie screening. In the middle of the screening, he stopped it and added comments to facilitate students' understanding of the story and to highlight the music in the movie. He believed the movies contributed to the students' cultural level.

> *When I showed musicals and other cultural works, students asked me the titles, and parents told me their children repeatedly listened to them at home. Then, I was so proud of myself because I made such a beneficial impact on their cultural experience. I am not sure, but I think there might be some difference in cultural level between students who have seen these things and some who never have. So I'm doing the work of … something like disseminating culture. (3rd interview)*

The more the students actively responded to the movies and their music, the more he solidified his deficit thinking about them. In other words, he saw them as empty vessels that he was filling with "high-level culture." On the other hand, screening those movies was exactly the performance that assured his self-understanding as altruistic. While he supplied cultural capital to the poor, he perceived students' gain in cultural experiences as his beneficial influence on them. Also, the practice of teaching "high level culture" was founded on the extension of his trust in the power of cultural capital.

SEONG

The Classroom and Her Day at School

As I looked around Seong's 3rd grade classroom, I was slightly startled by the busy surroundings with various posters and activity-stations; I was able to instantly notice that Seong was carrying out many activities or projects. First, the back board decorated with

paper-stars was filled with students' art works. Next to the main board, there was an extra board, where she put a card for each student to stick a star showing how many books the student had read so far. There was also a space for students to put their own reflective writings about books. On top of the row of students' lockers, there were baskets containing various kinds of students' notebooks: Math Drill Notebooks, Notebooks for Test Practice, Extra Credit Notebooks, Notebooks for Handwriting, and Notebooks for Daily Learning Log. Beside these baskets, many stacks of student handouts were neatly arranged.

The left side of the classroom had four windows, and on the wall between the windows, 22 mail-cups were displayed, forming the shape of a house, in order to put complimentary notes for each student. On the windowsill there were small flowerpots with each student's own name card. Under the windowsill, cardboard cutouts for each student were displayed together in the form of a train. These were used as a space to put personal comments about classroom issues or reading discussion. The right side wall of the classroom was covered with many posters, such as a unit summary written by Seong or a collection of students' notes on a given theme.

On the front wall, a large blackboard under a small frame of the national flag had many word-cards. She routinely used these cards in every lesson: 'month', 'date', 'day', 'unit', 'topic', 'activity 1', 'activity 2', 'activity 3'. In addition to the cards, five group names and cups of color magnets were also found on the blackboard. An icon of a star was drawn on each card. There was a whiteboard on the right side of the blackboard. Compared to the blackboard, where she wrote about the content directly related to the lesson, she used the whiteboard to write extra information: a daily schedule, things to do in the morning or after school, a list of students' numbers who did not finish their work, etc. On the left side of the blackboard, a list of students' duties was displayed along with each student's name. Under this display, there were four sticker-boards for students' daily routines: tooth

brushing, drinking milk, writing a diary, and performing a personal duty. Each slot on these boards was covered with a student's name as the student finished his or her duty.

A teacher's large desk occupied the middle of the front of the classroom. On the desk, there was a desk calendar, which was filled with lots of memos, as well as a monitor, a printer, a telephone, a remote control, and a speaker. There was a wood-pointer to which Seong had affixed an icon of a star. A notebook and a students' roll were also put on the desk, and she continually checked them and wrote in them during the day. A copy of "The Ten Commandments for Teachers," which described the recommended behaviors for treating students, was inserted under the glass on the desktop. 22 students' desks and chairs were arranged in three sections of three to four rows each. The students' seats were decided by drawing lots every three weeks regardless of any other factors.

Seong usually arrived at school just about the time school began at 8:30. She did not hurry but looked around at the students and encouraged them to follow the directions on the whiteboard, which she had written a day before about what the students had to do in the morning. The routines varied by day of the week; for example, for Tuesday morning, she asked students to write complimentary notes for friends and reflective journals as the post-reading activity at the each station in the classroom, as well as to work on their Math quizzes. She put a bunch of Math quiz handouts in a basket and posted answers on the board so that students who had finished the handout could come to the front and check their answers. Seong had also already written instructions for students to re-solve one of the uncorrected questions in the Notebook for Test Practice. While students worked on these morning activities, she checked students' homework and diaries, and looked at the textbooks for the day. As students finished the notebook, she checked their work.

At 9 am, the first lesson began. After conducting four lessons, she led students to the cafeteria for lunch. When she came back to the classroom, she taught one or two more

lessons. As a 3rd grade teacher, she taught Korean language arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Physical Education and Art; English and Music were taught by the single-subject teachers. During lessons, she fully focused on her students; she maintained eye contact with the students and attentively responded to students' questions or presentations. While students read or wrote, Seong was carefully working with individual students.

At the end of the last lesson, she let students copy down a daily class note on the screen about homework, announcements, and materials to bring for the next day. At the same time, she filled the whiteboard with notes about things to do after school and several students' personal numbers who had not finished one of the day's tasks in order to ask them to remain in the afternoon. She also let students fill out their Extra Credit Notebook and Daily Learning Log. Then, after checking each student's completed notebook, Seong individually gave them a handshake and said "Good-bye." After the majority of students went back home, she worked with the remaining students. When most students had left the classroom, she prepared for the next day. She wrote a schedule and things to do for the next morning on the whiteboard, and printed handouts. Around 4:30 pm, when her work time officially ended, she began her paper work and preparation for tomorrow's lessons. She usually left the classroom by 6 pm.

Seong identified herself as a star; but what was significant was that she uniquely made sense of the star as a symbol for self-improvement, a responsibility to shine brighter. With the star identity, she had decorated pictures of stars for a signifier of herself everywhere in her classroom. While she kept applying this star-identity to her profession during the very first semester, beyond the physical environment, she also newly constructed and developed her sociocultural understanding of the students.

Fulfilling the Star-Identity By Advocating the Value of Self-Improvement

Since she diligently polished herself from the young age, Seong earned notable achievements in her school days. Even now, she was not satisfied with her current status, but very eager to set a gloss upon herself. Therefore, it was not surprising when I heard that she actively tried to prepare herself for teaching in advance of beginning her work. After becoming a teacher, she also passionately kept spurring herself to make progress in her work while she evaluated herself as an incompetent teacher, "a dusty star" (4th interview). Thus, she was eager to adopt seasoned teachers' practices in order to increase her teaching skills. For instance, right after she attended a training for novice teachers one Saturday in the middle of the semester, Seong came to school and by herself produced 22 Daily Learning Log, a notebook that was introduced by a senior teacher-lecturer. She said she hurried to immediately use the notebooks for the coming school day. Adopting desirable practices was a chance for her to refine herself and simultaneously to fulfill her star-identity.

In addition, Seong projected this self-improving identity onto her students, so she strongly advocated that students exert personal effort as well. One small example of this approach is that she led the class in shouting "I will study hard" at the beginning of each lesson. She even explicitly stated that she preferred any students who do their best and try to surpass their own personal best. This preference was actually revealed in Seong's relationship with her students, as I was able to easily identify which students Seong favored. There were two students, Min-Tae and Ji-Hyun, in particular. She told me that she "love[ed] them because they work[ed] so much hard" (3rd interview).

Both students were categorized as underachieving students and had a poor SES family background. Min-Tae, a boy, was mostly cared for by his grandmother while his parents worked; Ji-Hyun, a girl, lived only with her grandmother without her mother.

Because neither of their parents arrived home until the evening, Seong allowed them to stay at school, so they usually remained in the classroom until 6 pm when she left work. While the two students played in the empty classroom, she kindly answered all of their questions; even when the students asked silly ones, Seong responded sincerely. At each observation, I was so impressed by her patience and warm heart toward them. Even when the two students continued joking with her in response to her request for them to return home so that we could conduct our interview, she did not become upset, but kept asking them to excuse her with love. During the interview, I was able to hear again how much Seong was deeply concerned about the poor circumstances and low achievement of the two students, whom she identified as ones giving their full effort to do better. In the case of Min-Tae, she confessed that she was even "trying to intentionally lead him to earn any opportunities that empower him and also giving him prizes on purpose" (2nd interview).

She seemed to feel a sense of kinship with these two hard-working students. Since she found her own identity in the endeavor for self-improvement, she might be pleased with the students in whom she could glimpse some aspects of herself. Further, she seemed to both overtly and covertly support the value of self-effort through giving extra attention to them. In turn, as she advocated her motto of personal endeavor to the class, she could reaffirm her identity.

I also found her endorsement of these value in her reaction to another two students, Bo-Mi and Gue. They were in similar circumstances as the previous two students, poor and extremely underachieving. Bo-Mi, a multicultural student, went on foot to a test taken at the end of semester and Gue, uncared for at home, was placed just in front of Bo-Mi. Yet, for these two, she showed the opposite attitude and neglected them. This was because she viewed them as individuals who did "not make any effort to achieve although they [were] not very slow or poor of understanding" (4th interview).

I should help them, but I think I am a person who mostly helps those who try to do their best. Just like Min-Tae. However, there is Gue, who is in a very serious condition. So, I tried to give additional instruction to him[34]; yet, he always ran away from me. Now, I don't want to deal with him anymore. I got so upset with him. He never works on the assignments. This behavior is repeated every day. Therefore, I won't (pay attention to him) because he does not have any will to do anything. If he doesn't want to work, there is no way to force him. Bo-Mi is the same. She hates to do any work. (3rd interview)

She withheld her attention from the two students because they had weak wills for advancement. Although she generally expressed a concern about unprivileged students during interviews, she treated these students differently according to the individuals' efforts. This practice was no more than a frank expression of disapproval about their mindset; moreover, it seemed that she detached herself from them because she perceived that they stood against or denied her core value, on which she formed her own star-identity. Thus, just like her close attention to the previous two students, her distance from these two students was also a sign that she chose to advocate her value of self-effort to herself and to her class. I was able to clearly identify this distance she put between herself and the students during a Math lesson. She separated the two students in another room and let an assistant teacher teach them. She decided to do in that way by herself, without teacher leadership's permission; so she was worried about the possible trouble due to the administration's disapproval.

Originally, the assistant teacher was supposed to be in my classroom and help the low achieving students during my lesson. However, I asked her to separately teach the two students in a material room during my Math lessons.

[34]In the beginning of the semester, she even appointed Gue as the only student for whom she would additionally care as part of a district project.

You know, the Math lesson was chaos before and I was so stressed, but now I feel better. Except for those two students, the others mostly pay attention to the lesson. So, now I can teach the way I want to. I think it is better for them and for me. If they sat in my lesson, they would do nothing; they never work on any questions. (4th interview).

The separate lesson, which had a low ratio between instructor and students, might be perhaps helpful for the students to learn more, but it seemed Seong intended the segregation as a negative consequence of their weak willingness to learn; the fact that the other five underachieving students still remained in the classroom reveals this underlying motivation. From this case, it became evident that the difference in her attitudes toward certain students, which was in line with students' will for self-improving, was a device validating and supporting her star-identity. As a novice teacher, it was a way she established her identity in her profession.

Meanwhile, although she detached herself from Gue due to his passive and lethargic attitude, she still felt a responsibility for affectively treating him.

I feel sorry for him. For next semester, I'm trying to think of new solutions for Gue; shall I give him homework that he is able to do? I heard that this kind of student needs a reachable, step-by-step goal instead of a challenging goal, so that they will keep working. I will look for some information and materials. (4th interview)

Interestingly, this concern for Gue, contrasting to her general cold attitude toward him in the classroom, was also explained by her star-identity, which polishes itself hard to shine more brightly. In other words, it seemed her earnest desire to fulfill her self-improving identity was strong enough to overcome her negative emotions. Simultaneously, making a positive change to motivate a low-achieving student could be a certain

accomplishment of her star-identity. Therefore, she eventually decided to look for resources to improve Gue's chances for success.

Concretizing Negative Multicultural Understanding By Appearing Indifferent

As a way to achieve her star-identity, Seong showed a willingness to move closer to Gue. However, compared to the case of Gue, she did not make any movement but maintained her detached attitude to Bo-Mi, the only multicultural student in her class. When Seong frankly spoke her mind, she kept expressing a very negative emotion toward the student.

> *Except Bo-Mi, (I like all of my students). … I don't treat her with any extra favor. Rather, I'm leaving her alone now (laugh). I don't pay any additional attention to her. (3rd interview)*

During interviews, she consistently described the student as a liar and a problem child. I was not able to sense any space in Seong's heart to be close to Bo-Mi. Even when some female students treated Bo-Mi meanly, Seong thought nothing of their behavior, but interpreted it as happening because they were frustrated with Bo-Mi's incompetence (3rd interview). However, this exceptionally cold manner toward Bo-Mi was not sufficiently explained by the student's unwillingness to learn or achieve, especially when considering the similar case of Gue. It seemed there was another layer Seong placed on Bo-Mi.

As I noted in Chapter Five, Seong had negative stereotypes about and hostility against multicultural people in society. Further, she was also discontented with the supports or programs designed for multicultural students since she thought there were too many of them and that they were useless. In addition, she understood multicultural education as the work of a bilingual teacher or a specific teacher in charge of it, but not as her responsibility.

Yet, she presented her antagonism toward this group in a distinctive way during interviews, mostly in the form of indifferent and unthoughtful answers. Remarkably, this kind of apathy was likewise found in her attitude toward Bo-Mi. Thus, I could identify Bo-Mi's multicultural background as the one additional layer that caused Seong's persistent indifference toward her.

Seong regarded Bo-Mi as not being any different from general Korean students; however, she was aware of a language issue Bo-Mi was struggling with regarding academic language.[35] Even though her everyday Korean sounded fluent, Seong was making sense of Bo-Mi's incompetence in academic language as follows: "Bo-Mi [had] limited exposure and she [did] not read books (at home)" (2nd interview). Nevertheless, Seong did not actively encourage her to take a language lesson, which Bo-Mi was supposed to attend regularly. This was not only because Seong assumed that "Bo-Mi won't take the class due to other scheduling conflicts" (2nd interview), but also because she was more likely to withdraw her attention itself while she identified the reminder as "not my required duty" (3rd interview). She did even not know whether Bo-Mi attended or not. Her indifference toward the mentoring program was same. At least she knew that Bo-Mi was attending the tutoring sessions due to a call from the mentor, but she drew a line when I asked more about it, saying, "It is not my job, but another teacher's" (4th interview).

There was one incident that clearly revealed Seong's extraordinary indifference toward Bo-Mi. One day in June, while Seong reviewed students' journals, she read Bo-Mi's. It said that her older sister and two of her friends, who were in 7th grade, visited her house and smoked at her home; they forced her to smoke, so she did while the others

[35]Bo-Mi had grown up with an immigrant Chinese mother while her Korean father had been away from home. Even if the mother had been in Korea for many years, her Korean was still not fluent. In her first call, Seong immediately became aware that Bo-Mi's mother was a non-native speaker without any prior knowledge of that fact (3rd interview). Therefore, Bo-Mi might have lacked exposure to the Korean language. For instance, during a Math lesson in the second observation, Bo-Mi asked Seong about the literal meaning of a question on a textbook: "how many grids are there to fill in?"

smoked all 23 cigarettes; when Bo-Mi told the two friends about her sister's coercive behavior, her sister came and hit her repeatedly. The day after she read this journal entry, Seong had an opportunity to talk about the incident with Bo-Mi. Through the conversation, Seong learned more about her family condition in addition to her pre-existing awareness that "it seems her mom doesn't care about her at all" (1st interview).

> *She really doesn't like her mom. Her mom hits her. Right now, Bo-Mi has such a severe bruise on her wrist that it is almost broken, so she is seeing a doctor. Her mom hit her as much as that. As I talked to her, oh, it was very serious. Her relationship with her mother is really worse than I thought. Her mom always curses at her and makes her do chores. Bo-Mi said she hates her mom because she has had conflict with her every day. She told me this frankly (2nd interview)*

It sounded like she had figured out how severe and urgent Bo-Mi's situation at home was. When I asked her about how she would handle this issue, she said:

> *It seems there is nothing I can do. So… I'm thinking about it. I will ask my fellow teachers in my grade for advice. Just in time, we are going to have a meeting later today. Introducing her to a counselor in the school might be a way (2nd interview).*

Exactly one week later, when I met Seong again for another interview, I asked how she had handled the issue. She was a little bit embarrassed by my question and said, "Oh, that is… There hasn't been any progress. I'm gonna send a note to a counselor at this school right now as I am reminded of it" (3rd interview). At that time, she sat at a computer and started typing. I was so surprised that she did not take any action until a week later because it was very exceptional compared to the loyalty and care she had generally shown to students in the class.

However, through reviewing my notes on her previous interviews, I could guess why she was unmindful of the student: it was because of her negative understanding of the multicultural family as poor, socially backward, and at risk. As she took a close look into Bo-Mi's multicultural family due to this occasion, she came to make a generalization that "the multicultural family is really in a serious condition from what I've heard" (2nd interview). Further, she concluded that the immigrant women do not have any affection for their children; "this is just how they are" (2nd interview). That is, she already concluded that the violence and threat toward Bo-Mi could not be helped because it was a common, static problem in all multicultural families. Therefore, she could evade any responsibility she was supposed to take as a teacher. Her negative stereotype about multicultural people might not be unusual in South Korean society and among teachers. However, her apathetic attitude was certainly a particular practice that Seong adopted and developed as she concretized the negative understanding beyond just accepting it.

Developing Deficit Thinking By Teaching in Meticulous Detail

While I was observing her lessons, there was one recurring and prominent theme, just like the behavior chart in Sae-Ra's class and rhythm-focused teaching in Do-Jin's class. It was Seong's use of the board or TV screen. Whenever she taught or gave an instruction, she visually presented the information step-by-step. She used the TV screen when she explained something on her computer or on the document camera, but most of the time, Seong wrote on the black- and whiteboards. Thus, after each lesson finished, the blackboard was filled with her writing or drawings, such as the date, title of unit, a goal of lesson, key concepts, a process of thinking, etc. She even seemed to copy most of her lecture onto the boards. In the case of her Math lessons, when she explained a Math problem, she minutely broke down the process and demonstrated each step using white,

blue, and red color pens (4th observation). Otherwise, she passed out a handout written just like a teacher's script. At first, this looked like a very kind and friendly approach to students; yet, as I repeatedly observed her, I felt that her overemphasis on making sure of students' understanding and offering detailed guidance sometimes disrupted the flow of the lesson.

However, this was not her only use of meticulous detail. Aside from curricular content directly related to lesson, she showed a similar practice when she explained even a minor topic or technique. For instance, when she asked students to make a mind-map as an activity for wrapping up a Science unit, she again demonstrated the way to draw a mind map, an activity they had done several times before, on the blackboard as if it were the first time - where to write one's name and a title, and how to draw sub-circles (4th observation). Another more unexpected case was observed in a Math class during the 6th observation, which was planned to teach concepts of time and duration. While she assigned students to create math word problems applying these concepts, she spent a significant portion of the lesson just enumerating possible contexts to apply them to, like eating, traveling, sleeping, etc. She wrote these lists down on the blackboard. These over-particular written instructions were not limited to lesson hours. At the beginning and end of each day, a to-do list[36] always filled the whiteboard. Moreover, at each break after a 40-minute lesson, she typed things[37] to do during the 10-minute break on the computer, then projected them onto the TV screen. She often added even "going to restroom[38]" (6th observation) to the list

[36]For example, "working on worksheet, checking your work, reviewing the questions you got incorrect on the note, reading books, and watering your own pot" for the morning and "finishing lunch by 1:10 pm, cleaning up, brushing teeth, marking the Extra Credit Notebook, filling in the Notebook for Daily Learning Log, submitting two notebooks (Handwriting, Test Practice) if you didn't yet" for the afternoon. (4th and 5th observation)

[37]For example, "drinking milk, wrapping up the activity, preparing a bold-color pen, and asking if you need a new pen" (4th observation).

[38]The written announcement for going to the toilet sounded very unusual for 3rd graders.

and also presented a timer at the corner of the screen to show exactly how much break-time remained.

The excessive explanation and guidance created an awkward impression; it was like spoon-feeding a baby. Yet, interestingly, Seong said she did not take this approach at the very beginning of the semester. As she had faced students' failure on tasks several times, she understood it as a matter of students' lack of capability or intelligence. Because she thought they were lacking, she began the detailed written instruction to make sure of students' comprehension.

> *I don't know but if I didn't show them like that, they could not perform. That's why I personally demonstrate everything in that way. If they could do it by themselves, I would let them do; however, they can't, so I do it instead. … In March, I realized that these students cannot perform if I give them only verbal instructions. Actually, they are still performing poorly even when I directly demonstrate the tasks in person. (3rd interview)*

Because she doubted their ability, she tried to give overly detailed instructions. Thus, it was her distrust of students' ability that led her to explain everything in a visual way using the boards or screen. Yet, her distrust seemed not to be grounded solely in students' poor performance; rather, she attributed it to the students' socioeconomic background. Her belief in that correlation was evident from the assumption that she would change her approach if her students were from an upper class background.

> *(If I were working at a school in the Su-Seong district[39]) my lesson would surely be different. Because the students are doing well, I would quickly point out the main concepts and do some fun activities. (4th interview)*

[39]The area was regarded as the wealthiest is in the metropolitan city.

It became clear that she held deficit thinking about her students due to their SES background. Actually, when she mentioned her students, she kept calling them "the students of this school," which meant underachieving students due to their poor SES condition. Although she had "no other school to compare it to because it was the very first school I've worked at"; as soon as she came to this school, she was exposed to a deficit discourse, which "every teacher in the school participated in" (4th interview). Then, since she was located within the prevailing discourse, it is certain that she was critically influenced by it. However, she did not passively remain trapped by the discourse; instead, she actively responded to it while she struggled with students' underachievement as a first-year teacher. Seong modified her teaching approach in every meticulous detail, and utilized the boards and screen to visualize concepts and tasks in order to make sure of students' comprehension. It was the way she developed her deficit thinking more concretely.

YOO-JEONG

The Office and Her Day at School

Yoo-Jeong came to school before 9:30. Once she arrived at school, she went to her office on the 2nd floor, which she shared with a single-subject teacher. The office was half the size of an ordinary classroom and looked like it had been originally allotted for storage. Two teacher's desks, which were not as large as other homeroom teachers', were placed side by side on the left side of classroom. As soon as she sat in her chair, she checked her email and the school announcements on the computer. After she took a breath, she went to a student's classroom for two hours in the morning. It was her other job, besides working as an ordinary bilingual teacher, starting this year. The office of education had contracted her as a translator-helper for 8 hours a week, but she helped the student finish her tasks

rather than offer a translation because the student was pretty fluent in Korean. She usually attended the student's Korean language arts and Math lessons. Every break time, Yoo-Jeong went back to her office and took a rest.

From 11:30, she worked as a bilingual teacher until 4:30. She entered classrooms that had multicultural students, spending an hour a day in each classroom. There were 10 classrooms, and she typically visited them each in turn, but recently she had selected five classrooms with students who needed her assistance the most. She helped the students keep up with and understand the lesson just like an assistant teacher. Even though she was assigned to the multicultural students, she cared for any students who asked for help. She carefully arranged her schedule so she entered during a lesson in Korean language arts or Math, the two subjects with which the students struggled the most. After coming back to her office, she had a friendly chat with another teacher in the room. Then, it was lunch-time. She ate lunch in a teachers' cafeteria on the first floor with other administrators or non-homeroom teachers.

In the afternoon, she taught a Chinese class[40] to any students who had registered for the afterschool program. She offered three Chinese classes according to grade level. First, the class for the lower grade level began. There were a long group desk and chairs in the middle of the room; this simple space without a board was the area for the lesson. Yoo-Jeong sat at the front of the long desk and began the lesson in the Korean language. She taught the students how to say numbers from one to ten in Chinese. Sometimes she showed picture cards, but most of the time she only referred to the book. After giving an introductory lesson, she checked on each student. When 40 minutes passed, she wrapped up the lesson as she asked students to practice more at home. 20 minutes later, the upper

[40]Because the class was free for students, many students had registered at the beginning of semester, but by the middle of the term, only seven to ten students remained in each class.

grade students came in, and she taught a higher level of the Chinese language. When there was no Chinese class, she tutored two underachieving multicultural students in her office.

When students left the room, she took a seat at her desk and briefly did some paperwork or prepared a lesson. At 4:30, she arranged her office and left the school. Once a week, she directly went to the college of education downtown and gave a lecture on the Chinese language to 40 pre-service teachers. On the other days, she gave private tutoring lessons to a high school student and a middle school student in the evening.

Yoo-Jeong recalled her days in China as successful. Even though she, as a Korean-Chinese woman, was a minority there, she did not experience serious discrimination due to her racial status. She had grown up in a secure family living in a large capital city, graduated from a university, and had a promising job as an engineer. After marriage, she continued a rich lifestyle due to support by her parents-in-law. However, since she came to South Korea, she had lost her social achievement and position in China. Until she began working at a school in 2011, her life in Korea negated her previous sense of identity, such as her record of academic and professional competence and other accomplishments of which she was proud. Due to her unique background compared to the other three teachers, Yoo-Jeong was distinctly engrossed in restoring her self-image, and she evidently adopted her teaching profession for this process. Accordingly, instead of other sociocultural understandings, this section highlight how she fashioned her self-understanding, especially related to her ethnic background, throughout the process of acquiring her teaching position and also through her teaching work.

Reclaiming an Elite Identity By Comparing Herself to Other Immigrant Women

During almost 20 years in South Korea, her social scope was limited to the home except for part-time personal tutoring. This limitation was because of implicit social restrictions on immigrant women, including that her family did not want her to have a job either. However, it was also because she was not interested in the available jobs that seemed low-status or demeaning; "If there was a job, it was at a restaurant or a grocery. … I had no desire to work at such places either" (2nd interview). Thus, for Yoo-Jeong, there was no job opportunity to reclaim the 'self' who had been successful in China before the move. Rather, at a time when binational marriage was rare, she was often regarded as one of the laborers from China just due to her immigrant status (3rd interview). Although she seldom encountered that kind of misunderstanding anymore since a lot of immigrant women came to South Korea in the 2000s, she became identified with another stereotypical notion of a poor and pitiful immigrant wife. Yoo-Jeong was displeased with this image as well although she also projected that stereotype onto the other immigrant women as described in Chapter Five.

While she was struggling with that denigrating image, she unexpectedly attended a training course, which was designed to prepare immigrant women as bilingual-teachers. As she involved herself in a gathering of immigrant women from various countries for the first time at the training courses, she rediscovered her national pride, of which she had seldom been aware previously, through distinguishing herself from many of the other immigrant women, who came from developing nations that were not global powers. That is, Yoo-Jeong took advantage of that training to directly identify with the power of her country. In addition to this first step of restoring her identity as a Chinese woman, she retrieved her elite identity among other Korean-Chinese people in relation to the Chinese language.

You know, not every Korean-Chinese person speaks Chinese fluently. It is not true that all of them speak the standard Chinese language. There are really many Korean-Chinese people who can't speak Chinese well. Yet, there is no test for Chinese when hiring a bilingual teacher. It is a problem. For example, in Korean school, we learned a different Chinese from the language that Chinese students learned. It was at a lower level. The classes in my Korean school were divided according to the admission test. The first two classes learned with a textbook that was used in the Chinese school, but the other two classes could not catch up on the lessons using that textbook. So, these classes changed their textbook. Eventually, the second class was even falling behind, and grades were dropped. Then, they also learned the Chinese taught to minority groups. (3rd interview)

She, who attended the first class, was confident about her language ability. Even though her Chinese language level amounted to nothing in the training, Yoo-Jeong highlighted it as unlike other Korean-Chinese individuals and re-identified herself with her exclusive background. She kept contrasting herself with other immigrant women and reclaiming her excellence. This time, she focused on her Korean language level as an indicator to differentiate herself from native Chinese women.

To be hired as a bilingual teacher, an interview and a Korean language test score are required. Yet, I did not take the test. It is needed, but if you are fine at the interview, you don't need it. When you are not good at speaking Korean, they will require the test score. Some Chinese people have a hard time due to the Korean language. So, some Chinese people even give up the job. (3rd interview)

Yoo-Jeong, who had mastered the Korean language in Korean school during her school years, was already fluent in Korean. Thus, she felt more qualified than other native

Chinese candidates and very satisfied with her strength. Then, she could understand herself as exceptional even among immigrant women having a Chinese background.

Her bachelor's degree was also another resource she used to restore her elite identity. The degree that "had been useless and the diploma (that) was faded yellow after [she] came to South Korea" (3rd interview) complemented her qualifications; they helped her to get appointed to the position. She understood this elite background was a crucial asset in gaining employment.

> *There were a lot of people who failed to be appointed although they finished the courses. Originally, there was a set of criteria. First priority was given to the women who finished two courses, a course on "Preparation of Multicultural Parent-Instructors" and a course on "Basic Training for Bilingual Teachers." Second priority was given to those who finished only the second training. Then, third priority was for those who took only the first course. Thus, even though I was third priority, I was employed while other women were rejected. So, it became a very controversial issue. There were really many candidates, but I was chosen due to my strong interview. It was the first year for introducing bilingual teachers, and only 27 women were appointed (in the city). (3rd interview)*

Although she was at a disadvantage according to the hiring regulations, she passed the interview and was appointed. She thought her position might be possible because of her competitive aspects demonstrated in an interview or on her vita.

Throughout the hiring process from the training, she separated herself from the typical image of immigrant women. She identified herself as not an Asian woman from a less powerful nation, but a Chinese woman; she was not an ordinary Korean-Chinese person, but one who was competent in both languages, well-educated, and cosmopolitan. By comparing herself to and differentiating herself from other immigrant women candidates, she restored her elite image, which she thought of as an authentic feature of

herself. Thus, becoming a bilingual teacher itself boosted her identity recovery; in turn, she embraced her job as "the highest achievement" of her life (3rd interview). Therefore, when she was not treated as well as she expected at her work, strong dissatisfaction was a natural response.

> *During my first semester in 2011, the teacher who supervised me did not give me any work of my own but commanded me to follow her around. She told me that I had to learn the work for a semester by shadowing her. When I wrote a lesson plan, it might not be good because I did not have any prior experience. Yet, she ordered me to change it and change it again. I repeatedly modified it, but she kept saying, "It failed, so change it" or "it was wrong, so change it." I was so upset even though she was trying to be helpful. (2nd interview)*

Because Yoo-Jeong was reclaiming her competent ability and elite identity by being a teacher, she was displeased when she felt she was still degraded on the job. Yet, at that time, she also actively defended herself. For example, when some students commented on her Korean speaking as strange at the beginning of her teaching, she adamantly responded with anger, "It's not odd but just different" (1st interview). In this third year of teaching, confronted with another attack on her linguistic ability, she defended it again.

> *It was a multicultural lesson in a 5th grade class. One student said, "Why does a Chinese person not speak Chinese, but speak Korean?" She did not respond, but later when she mentioned a Chinese actor's name, she spoke in Chinese (in another class, she did not). As she fluently pronounced the name in Chinese, all of the students were surprised. It was evident that her Chinese ability was sufficiently proven. (2nd observation, Field note)*

Without as much anger as before, she showed off the extent to which she was more capable and different from other immigrant women. She indirectly but powerfully intervened in the attack. She actively protected her identity.

However, the bilingual-teacher position became inadequate to identify herself as an elite immigrant women. Because non-elite bilingual teachers were hired, she felt it was no longer sufficient to corroborate her ability and background itself.

> *However, the quality of bilingual teachers is decreasing. When I was employed, we had to be a college degree holder or at least have graduated from a community college. Yet, now it is okay if you graduated only from high school. As the office of education tries to recruit more teachers, the quality of teachers declines because there are a limited number of immigrant women. Now, there are no more woman who meet the original criteria. I was hired in the first year of the program for bilingual teachers, and people hired this year are now in the third group. Now, the fourth group is being trained, so it can't be helped. Any multicultural women can be bilingual teachers now. (3rd interview)*

For a few years, Yoo-Jeong was able to reclaim her background only through the bilingual-teacher position because it was worthy of her successful identity. Yet, the title came to not work anymore to completely dismiss a negative evaluation of her. Now, the position was meaningful to her only insofar as that "I am from the first-year group" (3rd interview). Thus, Yoo-Jeong, who disagreed with increasing supports for multicultural students due to the tax burden, felt hostility toward a large number of bilingual teachers because she worried about her own value being depreciated as merely one of many unqualified immigrant wives.

Just at that time, there was another opportunity to distinguish herself from other bilingual teachers. It was a position as the only instructor for a Chinese class at the college of education. For the very first time, the college was recruiting three lecturers from among

the current group of bilingual teachers for each foreign language class in Chinese, Vietnamese, and Japanese. She was unexpectedly hired for that position, so she re-enhanced her elite identity with it. Earning the only lecturer position in a college meant to her that she was the most qualified teacher among other Chinese or Korean-Chinese bilingual teachers. Thus, Yoo-Jeong greatly enjoyed the lecturer position and spent a lot of time preparing for the class compared to the classes at the elementary school. For Yoo-Jeong, the position was an apparent proof of her excellent background compared to other bilingual teachers. Therefore, she wanted to maintain the position, which was critical for recovering her self-identification.

Protecting National Esteem By Correcting Misconceptions about China

Above, I described how Yoo-Jeong adopted the bilingual teaching position as a means of reclaiming her exclusive history and of restoring her identity, even though the position was a temporary and low paid job. It was possible because Korean society usually acknowledges teachers as one of the high-status occupations. However, since the position had no longer become a critical resource to bolster her prestigious background, she was no longer possessive toward the position. Therefore, when she had to quit her work at Pebble Elementary School after two years[41], she did not look for a position at another school; moreover, she did not consider continuing in a bilingual-teacher position until the school contacted her again (3rd interview).

This story might tell us that she rarely felt a vocation for teaching itself. Her lesson, the so-called multicultural lesson that was held once a year in each class, effectively

[41]This might be because of a law that a worker earns a permanent position if he/she, as a temporary employee, has worked more than 2 years. However, there were exception clauses, so later the school contacted her to employ her again (3rd interview).

captured this sense of detachment from teaching. Three years ago, when she taught for the very first time, she was of course nervous, to the extent that she was parched with thirst (1st interview). Yet, since overcoming stage fright, she was not seriously concerned about the quality of her teaching. For instance, she left her office after the bell rang and entered the classroom late (2nd observation). She was not interested in improving her teaching techniques or student management: "I don't care. I don't feel pressure because I am not good at these. I am showing just what I am doing" (2nd and 3rd interviews). Instead, she hoped a homeroom teacher would be with her during her lesson to easily maintain students' attention to the lesson. Moreover, during lesson time, she mostly stood in front rather than walking around and interacting with students (2nd and 3rd observations). First, I assumed that she might feel awkward toward the students because she was unfamiliar with them; however, this was not the case. She said she knew most of the students because it was her third year at the school and she regularly entered several classrooms to help multicultural students (1st interview). Therefore, the overall inattentive attitude toward teaching lessons seemed to be saying that she did not identify herself as a good teacher, unlike the other participant-teachers.

Nevertheless, there was one thing Yoo-Jeong was passionate about in her lesson. She, who identified herself as a Chinese, appeared to have a strong concern about China's image. Whereas she often showed an indulgent attitude toward the students, she actively led the lessons whenever she mentioned something related to China. For instance, at the beginning of a multicultural lesson, she presented three pictures of representative Chinese items. She adamantly repeated and spoke with emphasis when students recognized 'dumplings' as a Korean food or when they didn't pronounce the name of 'Tiananmen' (Gate of Heavenly Peace) correctly. Moreover, she feelingly responded to students' ignorance of China. When she sensed students did not know famous Chinese historical

figures, she remarked as if this were unbelievable and ridiculous. It seemed she regarded the ignorance as a serious fault of the students.

This attitude got much stronger when she reached the main topic of the lesson. This year, she taught *Gumbo*, Beijing opera facial design, in the multicultural lesson. It was not a familiar item as much as I and even the principal of the school had not heard the word Gumbo before. Yet, interestingly, there was a deliberate reason she chose this unfamiliar theme for the only multicultural lesson of the year.

> *When the (Gumbo) pictures were posted in my office last year, students did not know about Gumbo but perceived it incorrectly. They said the pictures looked like a ghost, demon, and bogeyman, and they were scared of the paintings. For this reason, I decided to teach about Gumbo so that students are not scared but know about its true meaning. I want to let them know, I mean, I am teaching so that they would not think of Gumbo as a ghost. (1st interview)*

It was students' misconception that was a motivation for selecting this theme. She kept saying "students' misconception" in relation to her lesson and definitely found the lessons' worth in correcting misconception of students.

> *The Music curriculum covers foreign countries' musicals or opera, so teachers briefly introduce Beijing opera as well. Yet, they don't explain what it is exactly; whether it is a mask, or whether it is a ghost. For the reason, students are understanding it is a ghost and are scared of it. Therefore, I want to break down the misunderstanding step by step. … There is a chance to clear up a misunderstanding about my country. In the case of the students in the Chinese language afterschool program, I'm correcting their misunderstandings each lesson; yet, there is no opportunity for the other, general students. In that sense, I like this multicultural lesson. (2nd interview)*

Yoo-Jeong strongly wanted to contribute to students' knowledge of China. Therefore, what she was "most pleased about in the lesson" was that "students learned about Gumbo and Beijing opera" (2nd interview). However, she also disclosed her discomfort about students' misconception. Even before she illustrated the symbolic meanings of each color of the facial design, Yoo-Jeong reacted emotionally to the students' misunderstanding at the beginning of the lesson. Her words were delivered in an excited and high-pitched voice when she pointed out the misconception: "there are some students saying it is scary, but it is not at all" (4th and 5th observations).

(Yoo-Jeong presented the face pictures)
Students: Aahhhhh! Demons! Monsters!
Yoo-Jeong: (in a angry voice) No, it is not. They just painted themselves in thick make-up, but they are not monsters. I'm here to let you know that it is not a monster; so, please don't say that).
(Yoo-Jeong showed another picture)
Yoo-Jeong: What do you see on the face?
A student: Poop!
Yoo-Jeong: (her face suddenly hardened) You cannot say whatever you want to. There is a meaning behind this.
(A while later, another student said an inappropriate word)
Yoo-Jeong: (with an angry look) Don't say that word! (2nd observation in 5th grade)

She responded with emotion to the student's devaluation of Gumbo, a reaction I observed repeatedly. When she explained that the actors/actresses play only one character for a lifetime, a 4th grader said that would be easy to do. She refuted this assertion in a cross and assertive voice: "to take a role, the person must train for at least 8 to 12 years. It is a very difficult job. You need to know martial arts, dance, singing, everything" (5th

observation). These reactions seemed to mean that she considered the misunderstanding as a matter of her personal pride; so she got hurt as if she had been personally insulted.

Moreover, at the end of each lesson, she rebuked the students when they did not effectively recall what she had taught.

- *Oh, no! Wait, don't you remember? You must remember (2nd observation, in 5th grade)*
- *You shouldn't say the wrong answer again. You shouldn't say 'I don't know' next time. You must remember. (4th observation, in 1st grade)*

Yoo-Jeong's passion to disseminate knowledge about China and to correct any misconceptions was vividly illustrated in her after-school Chinese language lessons. With a few students, she directly pointed out their error and severely scolded them by tapping on the desk, biting her lips, or fiercely calling out students' names: "Chinese do not do it that way. Look at me and follow me!" (3rd observation).

Her focus in the lesson was mostly on how to resolve any issues devaluating her home country. This teaching practice might indicate that Yoo-Jeong, who undoubtedly identified herself as Chinese, was actively trying to improve Koreans' image of China. Hence, it was her affection and esteem for China that she actively protected through her teaching.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter showed how the participant-teachers negotiated their sociocultural identities. Although the teachers held certain sociocultural understandings, which were bound together in the social discursive frame, they did not passively accept them. Rather,

they actively fashioned their understandings through adopting/adapting their teaching practices by themselves. Meanwhile, through this subjective process of negotiation, they mostly reaffirmed their existing sociocultural identities instead of questioning or changing them. Besides the reaffirmation of their identities, these four teachers also clearly showed us how they adopted their teaching practice as a device for mediating their identities. The teachers performed in their own particular way or applied specific artifacts in a certain way. The practice itself was a resource teachers utilized to affirm their sociocultural identities.

Sae-Ra tried to sustain her exceptional self-image by raising students' test scores. Along with this practice, she promoted a hierarchical understanding with the behavior chart and shielded her multicultural hostility with the textbook. The music teacher Do-Jin enhanced his belief in cultural capital as he concentrated on the students' achievement and advancement. With his conviction about the value of cultural capital, he also more firmly established his deficit thinking of unprivileged students. By imposing rhythmical sense and elite culture, he tried to make a contribution to students' uplift and future success. Seong wanted to fulfill her identity as a 'star' so that she diligently worked as if she were giving a gloss to herself. Further, she openly advocated her core value of self-effort through her affection toward certain students. Besides, she strengthened her negative multicultural understanding by inattentively dealing with the case of her multicultural student; she also settled for deficit thinking on low SES students by teaching in meticulous detail with the blackboard and screen. Yoo-Jeong, who had suffered due to her lost social status, used her teaching position to actively distinguish herself from other immigrant women and restore her identity as an elite Korean-Chinese woman. Moreover, she mainly utilized her lessons to bolster her national esteem against students' misconceptions about China.

Furthermore, their negotiation of sociocultural understanding was uniquely based on their self-understanding. For instance, it was because of her competent teacher identity

that Sae-Ra hid her multicultural understanding and closely followed the textbook. Due to his self-identification as an altruistic person, Do-Jin was eager to provide any cultural capital to the students. Seong's meticulous teaching approach also seemed possible not only due to her deficit thinking, but also due to her enthusiasm for achieving a star-identity through hard work. It is needless to say that Yoo-Jeong's concerns about the image of China came from her Chinese, rather than Korean-Chinese, identity. In addition, I was able to see how the teachers navigated the dynamics and tension between self-understanding and understanding of their students. In the case of Sae-Ra, she made some students exceptions to her good-teacher identity in order to avoid incongruity with her self-understanding. Seong also reconciled an inner conflict between the desire to fulfill her own self-image and the need to reflect her identity to students by controlling her affective distance with one student. These findings will be further discussed in the following chapter. After discussing my interpretation of the findings, Chapter Seven will conclude with a presentation of several implications and final comments.

Chapter 7

Conclusions and Implications

This study was driven by the research question, How do elementary-school teachers in South Korea negotiate their own sociocultural identities through their teaching with multicultural background students? To answer this question, I first provided an overview of the South Korean social context in which the participant-teachers were situated. The social relations, which generated a stable capitalist class system, established a strong belief in the hierarchical system and furthered deficit thinking among South Koreans. Regarding race, the society also built its own racial concepts that combined its beliefs of white supremacy and Korean superiority due to its long and complex interaction with Western racism. An intersection of these two ideologies, classism and racism, constructed a negative multicultural understanding. Later, this study identified four dominant multicultural discourses. First, there was a cry to *save the day*—in other words, to rescue South Korean society from multicultural change. Although a sympathetic discourse in the society had been prevalent (even as it produced a pitiful and/or evil image of multicultural people), the anti-multicultural wave swept more widely over the society. Second, the world of multicultural education created an atmosphere that fostered teachers' indifference toward multicultural education and students. It became *none of teachers' business* because of the perception that the multicultural students received abundant—even excessive—benefits. Third, multicultural curriculum devalued multicultural education and limited it to two very simplistic images—an image of indoctrinating students in tolerance and another image of offering superficial cultural information: *that's about it*. Lastly, teacher education also realigned itself with the macro

social discourse that formed a negative image of multicultural families and their children. Because it mainly emphasized their problems or difficulties, teachers were exposed to a negative impression of their situations, leading to a pitying attitude—*That's awful.*

Four elementary school teachers working in that social location of South Korea participated in this study. The teachers offered their self-perceptions in their own narratives—how they identified who they were historically, socially, and culturally. In addition, I examined how they understood social relations and multicultural people. Interestingly, their sociocultural understandings, which I referred to as *sociocultural identities,* were not much different from the larger discourses found in the South Korean societal context. Yet, what is important about the participants' sociocultural identities is that the teachers continuously reaffirmed their identities. They reaffirmed their self-understandings as they tried to preserve, fulfill, or reclaim their identities. Sae-Ra was eager to perform as an excellent teacher to match what she viewed as her superior identity; Do-Jin tried to make a contribution to students' achievement and future success as an altruistic person; Seong advocated self-effort, which was a key attribute of her own sense of self; and Yoo-Jeong, as an immigrant herself, made her elite identity stand out among other immigrant women and guarded her national esteem. These reaffirmations similarly happened in contexts of the participants' understandings of social relations by that they incorporated these understandings into their teaching practices. For example, while placing herself in the first-rate category, Sae-Ra kept applying a hierarchy according to one's socioeconomic background that informed her classroom behavior chart. Do-Jin highlighted his belief in sociocultural capital by focusing on teaching rhythm, and he reinforced his deficit thinking by teaching students about "high-level culture." Seong accepted a prevalent form of deficit thinking and actively incorporated it into her meticulously detailed teaching. Along with these understandings, the participant-

teachers also strengthened their multicultural beliefs. For instance, Sae-Ra and Seong sought to retain their beliefs about multicultural students and their families, however prejudiced, by deferring to curriculum or appearing to have no say in the matter (i.e., indifferent).

To conclude this study, Chapter Seven, consisting of three parts, will discuss conclusions, implications of this research, and final thoughts. The first part will comprise discussion of interpretations of the findings, offering three main conclusions about how the teachers negotiated their sociocultural identities. In the second part, there will be several implications drawn from these three conclusions in relation to the significance of teachers' critical sociocultural identity. First, I will offer suggestions on how teacher education might be transformed to better address critical sociocultural identities of teachers. Next, suggestions for a transformation in our views about teaching as well as in educational contexts will be made. Finally, I will address how the findings and implications from this study speak to the larger literature. At the end of the chapter, I will present closing remarks about the study's ultimate orientation toward critical multicultural education—equity, and justice in education—which underlies this project.

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

This study's findings have been presented over the course of three chapters, beginning with social discourses (Chapter Four), individual teachers' sociocultural identities (Chapter Five), and finally, teachers' negotiation of their identities (Chapter Six), which illustrate the influence of social force, simultaneously with their own agency in authoring their identities. In addition, this process of negotiation, when accompanied by the teachers' teaching practice, entailed a new perspective on how teachers teach and

in turn, the meaning of teaching practice. Yet, before discussing these three conclusions, I will first revisit the teachers' sociocultural identities, which is necessary not only to interpret the act of negotiation, but also to understand its implications.

Sociocultural Identity

The four teachers held various sociocultural understandings; yet, there was one distinct idea that they had in common: the concept of hierarchy. All of them made sense of themselves and of social relations on the premise that a stratified structure is natural or inevitable. Most of all, for the teachers, it seemed the hierarchy of social class was too obviously inherent to critically question. Instead, they seemed aspired to reach or preserve the highest levels of the structure. Altogether, the superior self-images of Sae-Ra and Yoo-Jeong, along with Seong's desire to improve herself, and Do-Jin's craving for social success showed how much they incorporated stratified social categories into their own identities. This strong hierarchical understanding of class is not different from the ideology of the society, which is based on the long history of class-based social systems as explained in Chapter Four. Hence, considering the social force, it is no wonder that Sae-Ra counted a person's SES as the most critical factor for one's quality, and Do-Jin considered the low SES group as social losers. Moreover, the social conviction about the class systems might also explain Do-Jin's and Yoo-Jeong's firm beliefs—why they expected the system would not change despite their awareness of inequity in the system, why Do-Jin actively guided his daughter toward academic success, how Do-Jin had evident self-confidence based on his upward mobility, and how Yoo-Jeong's concerns about personal losses kept her resistant to supporting social reform.

Additionally, deficit thinking was commonly found in the three participant-teachers' low expectations of students from economically challenged backgrounds. Sae-

Ra viewed them as abnormal; Do-Jin regarded them as genetically and culturally deficient; and Seong thought they were not as ready to learn. Meanwhile, the teachers made sense of their relatively higher class status as the result of their competence and ability, detached from the societal system. Even though they understood the general significance of parents' capital and support for one's achievement in society, they evaluated their own successes as a product of personal ability, and they were proud of themselves. This understanding seems also closely aligned with a deficit ideology in South Korean society. However, Yoo-Jeong was an exception to this trend. She used the word "exodus" (2nd interview) to describe how one student's family moved out of their low-rent housing complex, but she did not explicitly express deficit thinking about students' economic background. This difference might be owing to her experience with communism in China. Although China had a very similar feudal status system like Korea—which developed a belief in one's innate status—during its long history, she actually had grown up during a period in which China adopted a communistic political system, and later she experienced a partial market economy for about ten years before relocating to South Korea. Since then, she preferred the "freedom" of its market economy system to the previous "choiceless" system in the socialist economics of China (3rd interview). From this conversation, I cautiously suppose that the absence of deficit thinking might be because she, at least partially, recognized the systemic limitations on an individual's life. However, at the same time, she disapproved of wide-scale change that might benefit underprivileged people at her expense.

Along with classism, the participant-teachers altogether subscribed to a notion of racial hierarchy. The delicate racial comparison of Koreans to the Chinese and Japanese might be explained by the numerous battles and wars between them throughout history. In addition, belief in a monoracial Korea—even though it is referred to as "an

illusion/fantasy with no scientific basis" (S-D Seol, 2007, p 127)—might also perhaps explain their racial pride. However, the belief in a pure Korean bloodline does not explain the teachers' preference for white Europeans and Americans. If the pure blood notion was the basis of their racial hierarchy, any other race of people, including Anglo-Saxons, should be considered as an attack on their Koreanness. Yet, Sae-Ra, Do-Jin, and Seong explicitly positioned themselves under Caucasians while looking down on Africans, Mexicans, and other Asians. These beliefs indicate that the teachers held a distinct image and preference for individuals based on skin color and ethnicity. Interestingly, these racial understandings were also deeply related to racial discourse in the society: Whiteness and Koreanness. Meanwhile, a Chinese-Korean teacher Yoo-Jeong, who had grown up in China and still identified herself as Chinese, also displayed a certain amount of racism, expressing pride in her homeland China in relation to migrant wives from other countries and resentment toward prejudice against her nationality. Further analysis of this observation—whether it was based in sinocentrism (the ethnocentrism of China) or related to Western colonialism—must be omitted because the discussion extends beyond the scope of this study.

Another common understanding of the four participant teachers was a disdainful perception of multicultural people. They evaluated the non-white and low-class multicultural families as a threat to social security (Sae-Ra), as social losers (Do-Jin), as socially backward (Seong), and as poor and low-status individuals (Yoo-Jeong). Yet, it might be not surprising at all when considering the previous two threads of social discourse in which the teachers were embedded: (1) the understanding of low-class status as being destined and reflecting an innate deficiency, and (2) the understanding of South Koreans as being a superior race, against which other non-whites are found lacking. Whether they focused more on class status (as did Sae-Ra) or on racial background (as

did Do-Jin), they stood within the matrix. Moreover, the three South Korean teachers did not accommodate even the assimilationist opinion but occupied a position far from even conservative multiculturalism. In addition, they were altogether discontented with the government's assistance policy for multicultural people and directly voiced their hostility: "I don't like multicultural change" (Sae-Ra, 2nd interview); "I, frankly, cannot accept a multicultural society" (Do-Jin, 3rd interview); and "If we got rid of them, it would be the most neat and tidy solution" (Seong, 3rd interview). Their firmly entrenched deficit thinking toward the group is self-evident. Do-Jin showed an extreme instance of this: because he believed assistance would be useless due to their inherent deficiency, he considered multicultural education just as a preventive measure to avoid further problems. However, an immigrant woman, Yoo Jeong, held a slightly different perception. While she positioned multicultural students low on the class and racial hierarchy, she acknowledged their lack of opportunities. Yet, she still claimed the need for their assimilation into South Korea.

Their negative multicultural understanding also seems related to unequal gender concept. As the most multicultural students of the four teachers—to be exact, all but except one—were children of migrant women and as the most multicultural people they had ever encountered were migrant women of binational marriage rather than migrant workers, the teachers' disdainful attitude toward multicultural populations were not irrelevant to their gender perception. The teachers perceived migrant women as coming only on economic grounds and this indicates they did neither acknowledge migrant women's subjectivity in marriage nor question the commodification of migrant women. Although Yoo-Jeong was a migrant women and actively rejected that kind of identification on herself, she also held and applied the concept on other migrant women. While the women were identified just as wives of South Korean men instead of

independent individual human beings, consequently there was another identification of them; it was not anything else but a mother of multicultural students. The women were confined as no more than caregivers or nurturers, so the teachers simply blamed the mothers for multicultural students' low achievement as if the only one contributor. Simultaneously, thus, they were blinded to the responsibility of whole family, school, and society on academic gap. However, the teachers were not even aware of the distorted gender understanding, but took it for granted.

The Influence of the Figured World

The more I explicated the participant-teachers' sociocultural identities, the more it became evident that the teachers' identities were negotiated within the historical, cultural, political, economic, educational, and social contexts they inhabited. Not only impacted by the social context extending over several centuries, the present social discourses also socialized and racialized these individuals to a certain extent. These social controls are found from the self-understanding of each participant-teacher; they were limited in a way by the social assumptions of supremacy, a performance-based system, meritocracy, hierarchical class, social mobility, etc. The teachers' multicultural understandings also showed the social influence well; they were aligned with the social discourses as summarized above.

This study particularly revealed how the discursive frames of multicultural education exerted an influence on the teachers. An image of multicultural students as those receiving surplus benefits, which was affected by imprudent dispensation policies, seemed to arouse teachers' indifference; the negative description of multicultural families proposed by teacher education seemed to stimulate teachers' stereotypes; and the

superficial multicultural curriculum seemed to convey the insignificance of this type of education to teachers. In addition, at the intersection of these discursive frames, South Korean multicultural education also seemed to impose certain images of multicultural students along with deficit thinking. By focusing aid on language and academic achievement, it reinforced the stereotypic perception of multicultural students as inept at Korean and academically at risk. Moreover, by presenting other cultures as departures or deviations from the South Korean standard, the curriculum promoted the notion that these students have exotic, strange, or unfamiliar cultures, which show departure from the standard South Korean culture. Therefore, due to this stereotypical and essentialist image, multicultural students were expected to demonstrate different cultural practices from dominant South Korean norms, including low academic achievement and strange speech. Simultaneously, within this framework, many multicultural students became excluded from teachers' attention. If a multicultural student had no problem communicating in Korean, the participant-teachers easily perceived the student as someone perfectly accustomed to the South Korean system. Or, if the teachers did not outwardly observe any tangible cultural difference from a multicultural student, they carelessly considered him/her as one of the Korean students who does not have any cultural difficulties. Until my visit, Do-Jin, a music teacher, did not even know who the multicultural students were among the 3rd to 5th graders he taught. Moreover, in the case of Sae-Ra, when a multicultural student achieved higher than average scores and his family was not extremely poor, she became more resistant to acknowledge the social obstacles the student might encounter as a multicultural student.

Based on a series of findings, I came to the conclusion that the social framework which disfavors multicultural students permeates teachers' sociocultural identities. In fact, the social framework's influence on members' identities has been recognized by

numerous scholars. Whether employing the concept of economic realities, social structure, or cultural capital, these theorists have argued that one's identity is bound by sociocultural factors' influences (Marx & Engels, 1999; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Bourdieu, 2000). In addition, the global effects of colonialism and neoliberalism have been critically examined (Mignolo, 2005; Giroux, 2010). In this vein, this study also upholds that social control, whatever the named ideology or discourse, wields its force on the members of the society. However, social location or discourse did not one-sidedly determine the participants' identities. Rather, the teachers' agency had an important role in identity formation. This is discussed as a second conclusion below.

Teachers as Agents of Their Sociocultural Identities

In Chapter Two, I already challenged a one-way construction paradigm and presented an interconnected and reciprocal process of identity construction at a theoretical level: while figuring out a world by participating and involving oneself in a particular society, individuals fashion their own identities as agents (Holland et al., 1998). Interestingly, one's agency and control in identity formation—questioning, transforming, accepting, maintaining, developing, or reaffirming—were clearly demonstrated in the cases of the four participant-teachers. For instance, they intentionally differentiated the multicultural students for their family backgrounds and maintained certain attitude toward them in spite of a discourse that the students who possess similar skin color and speak Korean fluently are not different from Korean students. Likewise, they actively solidified and bolstered the existing hierarchical notions in their society. In order to retain and develop these sociocultural understandings, they even risked some portion of their existing roles and positions. Sae-Ra renounced her image of herself as a good teacher in relation to the three students from low SES backgrounds; Do-Jin abandoned a moral

norm when he selected singing repertoires; Seong separated two students who did not work hard at their Math lesson in defiance of school regulations; and Yoo-Jeong created tension in a lesson to protect China's image. It was also evident that all of them sought proactive ways to reaffirm their self-understandings in their teaching work.

Therefore, this finding manifests how each teacher actually exerted agency on their own identity. In addition, it also shows a tendency of the teachers on the part of the agent negotiation of identity: they tended to embrace the existing sociocultural understanding into own identity and then reaffirm it instead of questioning or transforming it. Even when the participant-teachers faced the tension brought on by inconsistency, they reconciled it and preserved their current identities. On the other hand, this finding signifies a crucial mechanism of identity transformation because the participant-teachers' agent negotiation of identities—i.e., their active reaffirmation of the existing sociocultural understandings—conversely tells us the potential for an agent to transform identity. In other words, if a teacher encounters a new sociocultural understanding and once accepts it, the teacher as an agent will actively reaffirm the new identity (Holland et al., 2008; Gee, 2000). Therefore, this possibility implies that the four teachers could transcend their given social frameworks and transform their sociocultural identities.

This agent transformation in teachers' sociocultural identities is also supported by existing empirical studies. Sarah, who had a majoritarian mindset in a study by Glazier (2003), is a good example. She participated in a book club of ten all-white female in-service teachers for six months in 1995. As she opened her eyes to distorted discourses in multicultural literacy by reading autobiographies of ethnic minorities and discussing related topics in their 'Literacy Circle,' she authored a new understanding of her racial and classed position, and reaffirmed her identity. In a study by McVee (2004), another

teacher, Ellie, also transformed her identity into "a white teacher and not just a teacher" (p 888). With six Euro-American women, she participated in a graduate-level literacy course that explored issues of culture, self, and others through reading multicultural autobiographies as well as theoretical and research-related articles. Through the course, Ellie constructed a different understanding about ethnic minorities and white teachers' practices. Both teachers transformed their self-understandings in terms of their privileges and personally internalized prejudices. Furthermore, they actively reaffirmed their sociocultural identities through trying to support and empower minority students' learning by attempting to make their curriculum and pedagogical strategies more equal and just for diverse students. Similarly, in the case of white teachers in an oral inquiry group (El-Haj, 2003), the teachers relocated their existing conceptions of educational inequity after clarifying the norms and assumptions of education though discussion. In turn, they actively resisted deficit talk, instead solidifying their new sociocultural identities by reconsidering classroom practices and developing a collective vision of inclusive community. The teachers in a study by Rogers et al. (2005) also fashioned sociocultural identities in a different way as agents. As the teachers gathered together and analyzed the district-mandated texts and manuals critically, they found racial and social assumptions embedded in these materials. When the teachers situated this critical view of systemic inequities within a broader social and political context, such as funding, tracking policies, teachers' salaries, etc., they solidified their views. Moreover, the teachers reaffirmed their identities by continually seeking to work for oppressed students. They did so at the micro level, by advocating for the social equity of linguistic and cultural resources in their classrooms, and at the macro level, by trying to change their communities and schools.

Hence, the finding of this study, along with the research discussed above, leads me to conclude that teachers negotiate their sociocultural identities as agents and transform their identities by confirming new sociocultural understandings. This conclusion offers advanced discussion about ways to provide teachers with new sociocultural perspectives as needed. I will discuss this point later regarding the necessity of teachers' critical sociocultural identities.

Teaching Practice as a Reflection of Identity

At the end of the discussion about findings, I cannot help but mention teaching practice. Whether a teacher reaffirms an existing sociocultural understanding, like the participant-teachers of this study, or transforms that identity, like the teachers in the empirical research reviewed above, both groups of teachers commonly use their teaching practices as a means to negotiate their sociocultural identities. Rehearsing a certain practice that confirms one's identity, thereby, secures more space to shape his/her identity: "They tell themselves and then try to act as though they are who they say they are" (Hollands et al., 2008, p 3). Therefore, a teacher's practice itself provides a scaffold or impetus to manage their identities. It implies that engaging in a certain practice also happens by agency.

Meanwhile, this practice inevitably reflects the identity that he/she desires to reaffirm or to achieve. Thus, even if two teachers use a similar practice, they eventually embody quite different ideas. For Sae-Ra, students' test scores were a tool to prove her competence and superiority. In contrast, Do-Jin utilized the results of students evaluations as a reference for them to improve their musical performance, consistent with his obsession over sociocultural capital. Even among the three teachers who highlighted students' learning in their lessons, the core of the practice varied: Do-Jin approached

learning as obtaining capital for students' future success; Seong emphasized it as required effort for self-improvement; and Yoo-Jeong utilized learning as a chance to correct students' misconceptions about China. Therefore, this study concludes that teaching practices adopted by teachers—instructional objectives, pedagogical practices, relationships with students, discipline systems, teaching materials, assessment to evaluate student learning, etc.—reflect their identities and further establish them. In this regard, this finding suggests a different in-depth view of teachers' teaching practice, viewing it as more than just a set of professional skills.

IMPLICATIONS

This study acknowledges the considerable influence that sociocultural factors and context have on teachers' sociocultural identities. At the same time, it asserts that teachers author their sociocultural identities as agents. Furthermore, this study identifies teaching practices as a tool reflecting upon, as well as enhancing teachers' sociocultural identities. Based on these conclusions, I will draw out important implications by circling back to the beginning of this study. Thus, readers may want to remember that this study, grounded in critical multiculturalism, was initiated by the necessity for teachers' critical sociocultural identity (trans)formation, which is crucial to implementing a critical multicultural education that pursues social justice and equity.

Critical Teacher Education For Identity Transformation

The importance of teachers' critical sociocultural identities cannot be overly stressed. In order to achieve justice and equity in and through education, critical scholars

have called teachers to internalize corresponding beliefs, perspectives, values, motives, goals, and knowledge (Banks et al., 2005; Brown & Kraehe, 2010; Enyedy et al., 2005; Gay, 2000; Howard & Aleman, 2008). It is because critical multicultural education is definitely dependent upon teachers' understandings that can be referred to as critical sociocultural identity (Marsh, 2002; Milner, 2003; Noel, 2001; Shkedi & Nisan 2006). However, most teachers in South Korea seem to have an opposite attribution. Like the four participant-teachers of this study, the other studies which examined or evaluated South Korean teachers' critical understandings also concluded that they, coming from relatively homogeneous backgrounds, lack experience with and knowledge about diverse cultures and people. Moreover, South Korean teachers in the studies took racial and class hierarchical systems for granted; they misinterpreted visible inequalities among students through a deficit framework and assumed low achievement for students from non-mainstream backgrounds, held stereotypes toward their students' families and communities, and performed passive or aggressive racism and showed negative multicultural attitudes (Kwon, 2010; K-S Lee, 2011; Mo & Hwang, 2007; Park et al., 2008; Ha, 2011). Unfortunately, the literature on dominant mainstream, teachers (often White and from middle-class backgrounds) in the U.S. also points to a similar relationship. Many also come from relatively homogeneous backgrounds (Zumwalt & Craig, 2008) and hold color blindness, myths of meritocracy, low expectations, deficit mind-sets, context-neutral mind-sets, and limited grounds of cultural knowledge (Kailin, 1999; Marx, 2006; Milner IV, 2010). This means that current teachers in both South Korea and the U.S. need to be challenged to reconstruct their existing sociocultural understandings.

In this regard, the conclusion of this study that teachers can actively author and transform their sociocultural identities is an encouraging sign because this implies that

even color-, class-, and multicultural-blinded teachers can come to hold a new, critical sociocultural understanding on some occasions. In addition, critical multicultural education becomes more promising with the finding that teachers adopt and adapt teaching practices to reflect and reinforce their identities since it means that teachers who reconstruct sociocultural identities with critical consciousness can modify their teaching to align with their critical understanding. Hence, what is consequently needed is a framework for supporting teachers to transform their sociocultural identities (Shkedi & Nisan, 2006). Since the transformation seldom happens naturally (Castro, 2010; Pollock et al, 2010; Sleeter, 2008; Villegas & Davis, 2008), there should be substantial opportunities for teachers to break out of their "cultural encapsulation" (Howard, 1999, p 23) so that the chances of promoting transformation of their sociocultural identities would increase.[42]

Given that teacher education is a primary means for teachers to deal with critical perspectives and to be challenged by them (Paccione, 2000; Sleeter, 2008), teacher education ought to be conducive to this function. At this point, the considerable influence of sociocultural context, one of this study's conclusions, also bolsters up the responsibility of teacher education because the world of teacher education itself is also a crucial location for identity formation. In the U.S., there has been an increase in the

[42]However, the agency of teachers in identity construction, on the other hand, may signify their resistance to a new understanding. If a teacher rejects an idea or concept, transformation of identity into that understanding would not happen. There are some instances of non-change when teachers refused a critical value-laden explanation of social relations. Most teachers in a study by McDiarmid (1992) did not change their stereotypes despite participating in a multicultural conference presenting a critical view; instead, they reinforced these stereotypes. Sleeter's study (1992) also showed teachers' resistance. At the staff development project, most participant-teachers did not embrace cultural explanations of students' capabilities, poverty, and racism. Some teachers in the study by Donaldson (1997) also did not transform their understandings, but merely acknowledged African-American and some Native-American contributions. In the case of the study by Glazier (2003), the other teachers chose to not pay attention to the privileges they had as whites and avoided the topic of race as "hot lava" (p 76). In addition, three teachers in the study by Zozakiewicz & Rodriguez (2007) remained entrenched in their previous identities, but only developed the thought that multicultural education was just another educational trend that would come and go.

number of studies that argue teacher education programs should embrace critical education and apply a programmatic social justice approach (Cochran-Smith et al, 2009; Costigan, 2013; McDonald & Zeichner, 2008). Yet, most of them have attended to only pre-service teacher education and there has been minimal attention to in-service teacher education (Cochran-Smith et al, 2004; Grant et al, 2004; Montecinos, 1995). In South Korea, compared to the absence of multicultural education for both pre- and in-service teachers before 2000s, its presence itself is worthy of appreciation even though it is not a vigorous, wide-scale attempt. Yet, the practice of teacher education of South Korea falls short of dealing with teachers' sociocultural identities as well as guiding them through a critical perspective (Mo, 2009; Mo et al, 2010; Hur et al, 2010). This comprehensive circumstance calls for critical multiculturalism-based programs, especially for in-service teachers. Therefore, four suggestions are given regarding the content and effective methods for the teacher education of South Korea and beyond.

Even though transforming identities does not occur in a linear manner (Baxter, 2004), the first step toward becoming critical, multiculturally minded teachers is recognizing their own socialized positions in relation to a stratified and racialized society (Scot & Pinto, 2001). When teachers open their eyes to who they are and how they are related to others by facing their cultural selves at the personal, political, historical, and even the sacred level (Tisdell, 2006), teachers can author new identities. Specifically, teacher education should help teachers to unravel the one race-dominant system of white people that has reigned historically as a global racial frame (De Lissovoy & Brown, 2013; Mills, 1997). For instance, when South Korean teachers become conscious of how European colonialism and white-stream frameworks have shaped a global ordering of social life and oppressed their lives as well, they will also recognize how they have reproduced these ideologies in relation to non-Koreans. Through political and

psychological decolonization, teachers will be free from the desire to possess exclusive power and will further uncouple themselves from own racial supremacy. In addition to racial awareness, teacher education should encourage teachers to broaden their self-understanding regarding complex power relations embedded in classism and societal inequity operating in schools and society (Martin & Van Gunten, 2002; Van Galen, 2010). If teachers would embrace critical sociocultural knowledge that has been hardly recognized in their dominant cultural surroundings, being aware of how they have been privileged or marginalized by the sociocultural systems, they could fashion a new self-understanding (Brown & Kraehe, 2010; Tisdell, 2006; Torok &Aguilar, 2000).

This encounter with one's sociocultural nature would lead teachers to expand their understanding of others as well as society (Giroux, 2000; Lazar, 2004; Nieto, 2003). Through positioning themselves on the political, ideological matrix of racism, capitalism, and neoliberalism, teachers become conscious of institutionalized inequities and oppression (Grant, 2012; May & Sleeter, 2010). Further, teachers come to apply the realization to their school context: how racism has been established in school and how school practices have reproduced inequities and constrained students' opportunities as a structural matter. In addition, they would unlearn deficit ideology and believe that every student, regardless of background, can achieve meaningful learning (Brown, 2010).

Next, teacher education should seek to develop effective and thoughtful methods to help teachers unfold this sociocultural knowledge. Transformation of cultural identities occurs neither forcibly nor naturally through only top-down intellectual exposure. Even though teacher education deals with each person's histories within social locations and with critical analysis of social systems, if these topics are presented only in a superficial, disconnected, fragmented, and noncumulative form, teachers rarely grapple with these ideas personally. It is because learning happens through a multidimensional process that

accompanies enduring changes about worldview in a person as situated in a given time and place (Alexander et al, 2009). Therefore, teacher education should provide suitable opportunities for teachers to autonomously engage with their experiences and thoughts, and to critically reflect themselves in relation to contexts instead of expert presentation of correct answers (De Lissovoy, 2012b; Hawley & Valli, 2008). Cases from the U.S. teacher education for pre-service teachers can provide examples of detailed methodological design, which show that there have been already many efforts undertaken to transform teachers' sociocultural identities (Sleeter, 2008). For pre-service teachers, most teacher education has been conducted through university-based coursework (Brown & Kraehe, 2010; Cokrell et al, 1999; Gomez et al, 2007; Lea, 2010; Lien, 1999; Martin & Van Gunten, 2002; Mueller & O'Connor, 2007; Pewewardy, 2002; Torok &Aguilar, 2000; Van Galen, 2010; Vavrus , 2009). During a 13- to 15-week semester-long course, pre-service teachers read cultural texts that contained the experiences of others, discussed sociocultural issues, wrote their own autobiographic reflections, and completed a comprehensive project as a final. Some instances of coursework provided a classroom teaching experience (Gomez et al, 2007) and cross-cultural community-based learning through volunteer work or action research in the community (Lea, 2010; Martin & Van Gunten, 2002; Mueller & O'Connor, 2007; Torok &Aguilar, 2000).

Although teacher education for in-service teachers has less studied in the U.S., the research still provides meaningful applications. Most cases were conducted as a form of professional development training (Burstein & Cabello, 1989; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1992; Donaldson, 1997; Hynds et al, 2011; McDiarmid, 1992; Sleeter, 1992; Zozakiewicz & Rodriguez, 2007). Other methods included a small community session conducted by a researcher (Glazier, 2005), master's programs (Glazier, 2003; Mahan & Rains, 1990; McVee, 2004; Shechtman & Or, 1996), and voluntary gatherings of teachers

(El-Haj, 2003; Rogers et al; 2005). Similar to pre-service teachers' courses, these programs covered comprehensive content and methods, but each program had a unique focus as well, such as lectures about various multicultural topics in workshops or seminars (Burstein & Cabello, 1989; Sleeter, 1992; McDiarmid, 1992), reading autobiographies of ethnic minorities and discussions in a book club (Glazier, 2003; McVee, 2004; Shechtman & Or, 1996), cross-cultural field experience of observation or teaching in schools with different racial and ethnic backgrounds (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1992; Mahan & Rains,1990), implementing a critical value laden curriculum such as an antiracist curriculum (Donaldson, 1997) or multicultural and gender-inclusive education (Zozakiewicz & Rodriguez, 2007), problem solving through structured oral inquiry processes (El-Haj, 2003) or through classroom practice changes (Rogers et al; 2005), and analyzing discourses and narratives of teachers (Glazier, 2005) or of students (Hynds et al., 2011). All programs were commonly based on reflective discussion in small groups and lasted from three months to two years, except for a one-week seminar in McDiarmid's (1992) study.

Among the various methods, the most common feature was sharing narratives in community. Telling stories, such as autobiography, life history, family histories, and historical narratives, in a community or a group is a recommended method because identity itself is discursively constituted and reconceptualized (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Trent & Lim, 2010; Souto-Manning, 2014; Zembylas, 2003). In addition, when teachers address sociocultural issues in personal stories, they come to question their existing knowledge and beliefs (Banks et al, 2005; Vavrus, 2009). In fact, the key value of narratives is reflection, which awaken teachers' critical inquiry, making teachers focus on their sense of self in a larger context (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Ladson-Billings,

1995). Thus, communal interactive storytelling and reflective discussion guided by critical teacher educators are recommended.

Lastly, I want to add one more point that should be considered along with methodological decisions. When sharing narratives in critical teacher education, emotional challenges may arise between teacher educators and participant-teachers or among the participant-teachers themselves because identity involves "strong emotional resonance," (Holland et al., 1998, p 3) and critical discussions can be "always an uncomfortable practice" (Freire, 2009, p 153). They may worry about being regarded as politically incorrect or ignorant when they touch on controversial topics (Milner, 2010). When teachers see how they have been privileged and/or marginalized, they may also encounter emotional anxieties, such as feelings of guilt, loneliness, fear, or helplessness (Aveling, 2004). Realizations about their misconceptions may arouse resistance or hostility among teachers (Howard, 1999). These emotions deeply affect not only teachers' participation and talk in discussion (Do & Schallert, 2004) but also their openness to sociocultural topics. The participant-teachers, Sae-Ra and Seong, avoided sharing their thoughts even within a casual conversation, and Yoo-Jeong was very cautious to speak out due to her multicultural background. In the cases of the other empirical studies, some Caucasian teachers felt frustrated (Pewewardy, 2002), avoided confrontation (Glazier; 2005), were reluctant to acknowledge their privilege (Sleeter, 2008), showed resistance (Mueller & O'Connor, 2007), and became defensive (Lien, 1999). Thus, teacher education must thoughtfully cope with teachers' emotions and further make an effort to create conditions in which teachers feel safe to discuss any controversial issues (Jersild, 1955; Marx, 2006). This safety can be generated in interpersonal relationships by showing empathy and care toward one another's experiences or by expressing acknowledgement of their peers' stories (Howard, 1999;

Ladson-Billings, 1995). In addition, sustaining teachers' willingness to participate in this critical journey is crucial as well. The negotiation of sociocultural identities demands not only emotional pain, but also a strong commitment to attendance, involvement, collaboration, and continuity (Hawley & Valli, 2008). Thus, initiating and maintaining teachers' motivation must be preeminent.

A New Perspective on Teaching Practice

Given the extent to which the necessity of critical education has been acknowledged in recent decades, scholars and educators have introduced a number of critical pedagogical directions (Bartolome, 1994; Brown, 2013; De Lissovoy, 2011; Freire, 1983; Gay, 2000; Gonzalez, 2005; Howard & Aleman, 2008; King, 1991, Kumashiro, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Tejeda et al., 2003). Along with these broad guidelines, specific teaching methods or skills have been also suggested. For example, Moll et al. (1992) requested that teachers become well-acquainted with qualitative research methods as "a genuine teacher-researcher" to establish "funds of knowledge" (p 139), including skills of forming study groups and social networks, planning home visits, and gathering and analyzing data. Curriculum reconstruction is another skill demanded of teachers, along with the insight to choose and develop appropriate materials (Darling-Hammond, Banks, et al., 2005). In addition, teachers are expected to be adept at regulating students' emotions and building relationships with them (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Milner, 2010), as well as to be reflective inquirers (Rex & Nelson, 2004). South Korean scholars have also presented several practical techniques or skills to implement multicultural education in the classroom, including utilizing movie clips, textbooks, or literature (I-J Lee, 2014); implementing virtue education and cooperative learning methods based on anti-prejudice education (T-J Jung, 2008); and evaluating students'

multicultural awareness and problem-solving abilities (M-H Kim, 2011). There is no doubt that those methodological ideas are valuable to adopt in one's lessons (Kumashiro, 2000; Cochran-Smith, 2010; Howard & Aleman, 2008).

Nevertheless, these teaching skills or methods alone cannot accomplish critical multicultural education. This study identified teaching practice as a reflection of one's (current or aspirational) identity; therefore, these teaching practices can embody the original purpose only when teachers embrace the viewpoints and values inherent in the practices. When teachers develop new understanding, they finally increase their participation in the activities that would produce and enact the particular new view (Urrieta, 2007). Thus, not only direct critical pedagogical methods but any teaching practices—even decorating one's classroom, choosing sequences of activities, allocating instructional time, developing assignments and assessments, and providing scaffolding for different students—depend on teachers' own understanding of their students and their social reality (Bransford et al, 2005; Brown, 2013; Kincheloe; 2004; Milner, 2010). Indeed, only a teacher who has critically reorganized his/her own sociocultural identity would be capable of mediating his/her rules of comportment in a way to reflect or enhance that identity. Furthermore, the teacher would place the rules at center and persist in them because he/she can reaffirm an important sense of self through them (Collier & Thomas, 1988; Wigfield et al, 2009). In fact, the participant-teachers of this study precisely demonstrated this mechanism of teaching practice. Therefore, construction of a critical sociocultural identity should be established *before* the attainment of specific teaching skills or techniques; in other words, teacher identity should be the crux of any attempts to promote teachers' critical practices.

Yet, it seems that current teacher education still treats "teaching" as a simplistic matter of isolated techniques or the transfer of content (Bartolome, 1994; Giroux, 1992).

In most cases of teacher education in South Korea, teachers sit in front of a huge screen and listen to fragmented information from an instructor's page-based lecture on slides. Professors or experts are invited to give lectures; otherwise, selected in-service teachers come and present their experiences as exemplary cases. Moreover, a single instructional format in terms of content and methods is provided to every teacher regardless of their experience, age, needs, and situations (J-H Jeong, 2014). This form of teacher education, which assumes that teachers learn the information while watching the screen and listening to the presenter, seems to consider teachers as relatively subordinate to the input of information (Prawat & Floden, 1994). However, even if teachers increase the amount of information retained, this intellectual competence is not sufficient for changing their practices if teachers do not engage the information with their sociocultural identities (Hawley & Valli, 2008). It would be impossible for a racially blind teacher to discern which materials contain distorted perspectives by simply referring to checklists for material selection. Therefore, the current approach to teaching, which deems it as a set of skills, is too superficial to reach teachers and affect their identities.

Hence, teaching should be understood in radically different ways. Instead of fragmented techniques, teaching should be considered as a sign signifying the meaning of the teacher-self. Beyond a precursor or one of contributing factors to teaching, identity has to be acknowledged as "having a direct link to practice" (Enyedy et al., 2005, p 69) because "consciously, [teachers] teach what [they] know; unconsciously, [teachers] teach who [they] are" (Hamachek, 1999, p 209). Thus, the one-size-fits-all notion about teaching and the dry, skill-focused training have to be critically questioned. In its place, there should be acknowledgment of learning new practices or skills as an ongoing process that involves the reconstruction and reinterpretation of self (Kegan, 1980). Moreover, the top-down instruction results in teachers passively relying on researchers, teacher

educators, or other seasoned teachers. By becoming accustomed to receiving information that sounds useful or effective, teachers come to lose their subjectivity in teaching and become excluded from the center of professional development and discussion. Therefore, apart from the view of teachers as blank slates waiting for the experts, teachers should be considered as the arbiters of what is taught and how it is taught (Darling-Hammond, Hammerness, et al., 2005). In turn, this new lens on teaching again highlights teachers' reflective opportunities to critically examine themselves as well as their pedagogical dispositions and practices.

Transformation of Educational Contexts

Because teachers' sociocultural identities are closely related to the surrounding contexts of space and time, the more teachers' agent authoring process is emphasized, the more corresponding social contexts becomes striking. Sometimes teachers are even overwhelmed by these borders (Agee, 2004; Flores, 2007; MacGillivray et al., 2004). For the reason, while asking for efforts to provide critical teacher education and to apply a new perspective on teaching, I also suggest a change in comprehensive educational contexts toward a more equal and just environment.

Most of all, there should be a space for critical teaching practice. The restriction of critical pedagogical practice leads to the oppression of both students and teachers. Throughout this study, teaching practice has been understand not only as a mirror of identity but as the impetus for solidifying teachers' identity. This conversely means that blocking critical pedagogical practice undermines the formation of teachers' identity. That is, the restriction of critical practice erodes the critical sociocultural identity of teachers, which is a key ingredient for equity and justice in and through education. Unfortunately, this oppression seems obvious within the curricular border. Beyond

discursive influences on teachers' sociocultural identity, curriculum itself can hinder teachers' practice. As Sae-Ra's case showed, one reason for the superficial 'tourism' of other cultures was a standard curriculum that failed to align with critical multiculturalism. The explicit curriculum of South Korea mainly covers superficial, essentialist cultural information for majority students from non-multicultural backgrounds, which are based on the concepts of otherness and assimilation. Moreover, the cultural knowledge or facts in the curriculum and textbooks are distant from the actual experiences and knowledge of multicultural students. Rather, these seem like another exotic culture even for multicultural students, who are mostly born and raised in South Korea. In addition, the current multicultural curriculum emphasizes tolerance from the stance of a South Korean-centric narrative. Therefore, there is little room in the curriculum to discuss power relations, societal inequity, racial ideology, and social structures. Explicit curriculum of the U.S. also delivers distorted images of minority students (Brown & Brown, 2010; Field et al., 2012). There are also critics on hidden curriculum compelling teachers to normalize students and place them in unequal positions (De Lissovoy, 2012a).

From the perspective of null curriculum, this curricular strict limitation on teachers is also found. A "Timely Lesson" in South Korea seems a clear instance. It is an additional lesson that covers a specific social, historical, or political issue or event on a relevant occasion beyond the official curriculum when needed (J-H Choi, 2013). A typical one might be this: the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Unification urge schools and teachers to teach on the theme of "unification" during a specific week every year (The Ministry of Unification, 2013). Because the Timely Lessons can be free from the official curriculum, which seldom provides opportunities to discuss sociocultural topics, the lessons seem to have significance in terms of critical pedagogy. Yet, in practice, the Timely Lesson is under surveillance. Just as education is not neutral and can

be navigated by certain interests (Freire, 1983; King, 1991; Noguera, 2003), the lessons are controlled and often result in transmitting dominant ideas proved by the government. If a critical approach is anticipated, the Ministry of Education exercises overt control or even prohibits this approach in advance. For instance, when it sensed that a group of teachers would autonomously teach about the human rights of students and workers with a critical perspective at the anniversary of a historical worker's death, the Ministry hastily published an official notice that mandated teachers to present a lesson plan in advance, to get a permission from the principal, and to rigorously follow the scripted plan (The Ministry of Education, 2013b). This occurrence is not an isolated case; teachers have repeatedly collided with that kind of restriction on their teaching (J-H Choi, 2013, The Ministry of Education, 2014).

Under these constrained conditions, it is neither easy for teachers to practice critical pedagogy nor to maintain their intention of promoting justice for the oppressed. Hence, these curricular restrictions that push teachers to merely transmit knowledge within political confines should be lifted. Curriculum should include new narratives instead of the mainstream's perspective, connect to students' lives and experiences, challenge the social reality and inequality beyond studying of the other, and provide opportunities for students' active participation (Ladson-Billings, 2004). In addition, communities of teachers and other authorities should encourage teachers to challenge the status quo of social order. It is necessary to foster a democratic school environment, in which teachers have a high degree of ownership and expand students' learning to critical analysis of culture, power, ideology, capitalism, and globalization (Darling-Hammond, Banks, et al., 2005; Sleeter & Bernal, 2004; Ryan & Deci, 2009). For these changes to occur, critical scholars and educators are requested to show their activism and support teachers' solidarity (De Lissovoy & Brown, 2013). It is only then that this space for

teachers to practice critical pedagogy will stimulate transformation and produce a sound critical sociocultural identity.

Restrictions on teachers' critical practice exist not only within the school borders but also in the broader social sphere. Oppression of teachers' right to free speech as individual citizens is a representative case. For example, in May 2014, a joint statement made by 43 teachers was posted on the official website of the president's office, which publicly criticized governmental affairs and requested the resignation of President Geun-Hye Park due to her failed leadership during the Sewol ferry tragedy.[43] In response, the Ministry of Education accused the teachers, and the National Police Agency and Public Prosecutors' Office filed an arrest warrant for one representative teacher. Later, when one group of 15,000 teachers and another of 12,243 teachers who were affiliated in one teachers' union published a declaration of the state of affairs and requested the president's resignation for the same reason in May and July 2014, the two representatives of the union were also issued an arrest warrant. The authorities charged the three teachers with a violation of their duty to maintain political neutrality, which is required of national public officials, including school teachers, under the National Public Service Law (B-J Lee, 2014).

The teachers' posting making claims about a just administration and criticizing the president is absolutely "political." In fact, every act of speech is political; even non-participation in the declaration is political in terms of expressing agreement or alignment (Mansbridge, 1999; Roberston, 2008). Yet, the statement was neither an example of "partisan political activities" nor "opposition or support toward specific candidates in an

[43]On April 16, 2014, the Sewol ferry, headed for Jeju Island, sank near the southernwest coast of South Korea, and 304 passengers drowned. More than 250 of these passengers were high school juniors on a field trip. From the operation of the ferry to rescue operations and the handling of the aftermath, the tragedy revealed serious irregularities. Furthermore, fumbling and suspicious responses of the government brought serious criticism and questions on the capability of President Park Geun-Hye's leadership.

election," which are clearly banned by law (J-J Lee & J-K Lee, 2011). Rather, civil servants' duty of political neutrality, which is not fully described and thus is still controversial, in some ways means the responsibility to independently "speak out on matters of policy and politics" because they "can never be simply 'servants' to political 'masters'" (Sossin, 2005, p 29). In addition, if the duty of neutrality is interpreted as silence, it may conflict with the basic human right for expression guaranteed by the Constitution of South Korea. Thus, the interpretation of political neutrality is open to dispute. Nevertheless, the mandate has been adopted on numerous occasions as a basis to accuse teachers of critical activism. Moreover, the South Korean courts have taken the teachers' side only seven times out of 31 cases (J-J Lee & J-K Lee, 2011). As these cases show, the current social relations wield overwhelming political pressure: they demand that teachers put aside their critical perspective and simply comply with the ruling party and existing authorities. Further, they alienate teachers and take away teachers' opportunities to adopt the very tools—i.e., critical discussion and action—that help to (re)construct their critical sociocultural identity. As a result, teachers come to adopt practices that are "inauthentic, but psychically safe" (Parkison, 2008, p 57), and the practices, in turn, invite teachers to reaffirm non-critical understandings. Ultimately, this vicious circle drives both teachers and their practice to deviate from justice and equity. Hence, secondly, I request social acknowledgment of teachers' right to embody and promote their critical understandings in the public sphere.

In addition to an autonomous space for teachers' critical reflection and practice in both school and society, educational policies should contribute to the creation of democratic, non-stereotypical discourse. Currently, there is discontentment over too many benefits for multicultural students and even resentment about reverse discrimination. Moreover, these policies of dispensation and assistance function to

segregate multicultural students to the social periphery and generate the cultural deficit or deprivation ideology (H-M Kim, 2014): “the schools are fine, it's the children who need help” (Darling-Hammond, 2004, p 623). However, the policies are indifferent toward the fundamental inequity in the students’ school experience. Whether there are dramatic differences in educational quality or not, students from non-mainstream backgrounds are barred from opportunities in general; this is due to the strong hierarchy in society, where race determines social class, and social class determines one’s life trajectory, including educational achievement. Moreover, in the academic capital-driven society, certain groups of students become marginalized from an early age by disparities in schooling. Regretfully, the inequity, unchanged for so long and so taken for granted in society, interferes with teachers’ critical understanding and practice, and redefines the systematic problems as helpless. Therefore, educational authorities should give their best efforts to transform the academic capital system. Without addressing this fundamental problem, the aid policies will be no more than relief for guilty consciences.

Future Research

This study, premised on the value of critical multiculturalism, revealed the social framework’s influence on members’ identities. Findings from close observations support the claim of existing literature about the influence on teachers’ identities exerted by social contexts, educational policies, work settings, and professional training (Flores & Day, 1996; Gee, 1999; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). Findings of his study also fill a gap in research with regard to how classism and racism have impacted on South Korean teachers (Y-Y Jang & K-S Jeong, 2012). In turn, this calls for advanced research about the contexts to which teachers belong, which asks, what kinds of context should be provided and what kinds of discourses should be generated? Whereas this future research

question is applicable to both the U.S. and South Korea, for the case of South Korean academia, I want to request a consensus about critical multiculturalism prior to this additional research (H-Y Park, 2012). While a liberal multicultural approach is much more prevalent (Na, 2011), and even conservative or more anti-multicultural literature is published (Y-M Kim, 2013), South Korean academia continues to dispute critical approaches. Therefore, this study urges more critical discussion in South Korea as it relates to educational inequity and injustice created by existing ideologies and power relations, illuminates voices of the oppressed and non-essentialized cultures, and encourages the development of solutions prompting educational and social change.

This study also challenges or complements what the extant literature often overlooks, whereas it mainly focuses on macro and external social influence on identity (Parkison, 2008). As the holistic result of this study asserts, the teacher identity is not only "fixed in social address categories" (Rogoff, 2003, p 77) but is also a creation in the making by the person's practice, even while he/she participates in a particular sociocultural context (Holland et al, 2008; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Thus, this study's importance lies in the supplementation to the larger literature that neglects the subject of teachers' agency in the formation of their identities as well as that calls attention to the teachers' agency in their identities (Agee, 2004; Flores, 2007). This study on the other hand confirms the academic argument that identity is not a static and fixed form; rather, it is unstable, shifting, and negotiated by the self, the meaning maker (Akkerman & Meijer, 2011; Rodgers and Scott, 2008; Sachs, 2005; Urrieta, 2007; Wenger, 1998). Inasmuch as the four teachers' identities were confirmed through their actions, this study affirms that identity can transcend given labels and involve a dynamic process of becoming.

Another importance of this study is found in its thick description about teachers' sociocultural identities. Given the scarce research about sociocultural identity in South

Korea, this study lays a cornerstone for future research. Moreover, this study underlined the importance of teachers' critical sociocultural identities and the facilitation of critical transformation. Hence, future studies should expand the discussion about teachers' critical sociocultural identities. They may be prompted by the following questions: How have teachers' uncritical mindsets provoked problematic issues in school and society? How might teachers' critical orientation contribute to equity and justice in and through education? Such studies can induce an alternative discourse and cultivate the ground for the critical transformation of teachers' sociocultural identity.

I want to additionally propose ideas for future empirical research attempting critical transformation of teacher identity. Although this study has discussed the importance of teachers' critical sociocultural identity and suggested guiding principles for its transformation, it has finished just short of applying them. In American literature, there has been a lack of application among in-service teachers. Moreover, in South Korea, there is almost no research on intervention programs aimed at reforming teachers' critical identity. Thus, the accumulation of empirical evidence will provide important cues about obstacles to transformation and suggest the need for more practical and detailed programs for critical teacher education suitable to the South Korean context. Along with, there is a need for literature that proposes a specific scope and sequence for teacher education programs in South Korea, which discusses how and to what extent teachers' class and racial hierarchical beliefs might be unlocked. In addition, research from various disciplines is needed to present rich and diverse perspectives on sociocultural knowledge that are the product of complex and holistic circumstances. Lastly, this study calls for the continuous monitoring of limitations of the educational sphere imposed by various forces and speaking out for its transformation.

FINAL COMMENTS

Constructing a critical sociocultural identity requires being aware of how Western powers and high-status groups have exerted their power over others. However, this awareness does not mean being ambitious to seize power for oneself in anger at both the oppressors and at the experienced oppression. Instead of becoming another oppressor—a wounded oppressor—oneself, being critical means being willing to abolish any unequal privileges that might benefit oneself but simultaneously produce the oppression of someone else. Finally, I may say that being critical means continuously making righteous decisions that would contribute to an equal and just society.

In this vein, this study was grounded in critical multiculturalism that seeks for a transformative movement toward social justice and equity (May & Sleeter, 2010). Hence, all of my arguments so far—that teachers' sociocultural identity has to be at the heart of teacher education; that critical pedagogical practice is meaningful as an impetus supporting their critical identity; and that the social and educational context should be democratic so that it promotes teachers' practice and critical reflection—are premised on agreement with the goal of social justice and equity. Thus, I want to wrap up this study with my vision for social justice and equity. What is social justice and equity, and what might it look like in practice?

Although I do not want to subsume multiple forms of oppression and inequity under one category, my answer to this question is that it is a society in which its members have peace without greed. When anyone from any background does not need to be greedy but experience peace in their lives, I believe the society is in a state of justice and equity. Even though there might be a certain difference in individuals' amount of social, cultural capital, if they do not need to continually strive to gain more capital or a higher position

compared to others but can be content with what they have and who they are, it would be an equal and just society because the peaceful state indicates that the gap would not generate a disparity between their beings and their lives. In fact, the present inequity and injustice, initiated by normalization, capitalism, colonialism, racism, and neoliberalism, results from greedy people who crave privileges for themselves by abusing the difference in sociocultural capital or generating norms. Therefore, through trying to get rid of discrimination, oppression, and bias, and trying to block an appropriation of privileges, the society would contain equity and justice.

Yet, this society does not mean another oppressive world for the existing or future people from a dominant background. Rather, it also gives freedom to the group of people who suffer from another oppression that was caused by their privileges; they finally become free from anxiety about their possible loss of privileges and from guilt about using deceptive schemes to obtain more. That is, an equal society has the fruit of peace for all people. On the other hand, if a society achieves equity and justice, the oppressed would of course have peace because they would become free from resentment against the other party and from any constraints on their own opportunities and achievements. This yardstick of peace for equity and justice is applicable to the educational context. An equal and just school environment would enable students from any backgrounds to enjoy peace at school and to be free from over-competition with peers or alienation. However, this peace cannot be achieved by hypnosis or indoctrination. Instead, this peace will be secured by systemic transformation that is eventually made by solidarity of individuals who make the righteous decision to abandon any unequal privileges and instead seek equity and justice.

Appendix A

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

First Interview

Life history & Cultural Background

1. Introduce yourself in terms of your childhood, upbringing, and family.
2. What do you recall about your experience as a student? What kinds of supports or challenges did you experience?
3. Why did you become a teacher?
4. Describe your teacher training. What kind of program did you attend? What kinds of experiences did you have in your program related to multicultural education?
5. How was your life as a teacher?
6. What, if any, critical challenges have you faced in your life?
7. What is your most highly regarded achievement in your life?
8. Do you have personal experience with immigration or multicultural context?
9. How do you describe yourself in terms of race, class, and gender?
10. Is there anything else that you would like to share?

Second and Third Interviews

Understanding of Multicultural Students

1. Tell me about your multicultural students and their family backgrounds.
2. What are the challenges that you think multicultural students have? Why do you think the students face these challenges?

3. What is the merit of the multicultural classroom? What challenges, if any, have you faced in teaching multicultural students?

Teaching Practice

1. What are your experiences around teaching multicultural students?
2. How do you meet the needs of students of color?
3. What do you consider when you design learning activities and materials? How do you decide what to teach and how to teach?
4. Imagine that you are a teacher of the student in *scenario X*. How would you respond or teach?
5. Describe your typical interactions with parents.

Understanding of Multicultural Education

1. What are your thoughts about multicultural education? How would you define this term? What do you think is its purpose?
2. What, if any, activities or events does your school hold for multicultural education?
3. What do you think the school and the office of education expects of you in regards to multicultural education? How do you know? Share with me an incident that illustrates this perspective.
4. What kind of support and assistance do you receive to engage in multicultural education?

Understanding of Social Relations

1. What do you think about how the current curriculum or textbooks you use address multicultural education? How do you adopt them in your teaching?

2. What do you think about how other students' race, class, or other factors influence the multicultural students?
3. Do you think race matters in the school and society?

*There were more specific questions after the researcher observed the participant teachers' teaching in their classrooms.

Fourth Interview

Teaching Practice

1. When you look back at this semester, how do you think of or describe your teaching approach and the experiences of students?
2. What is it like being a teacher for multicultural students? Is it the same or different from what you expected when you went into teaching?
3. What do you hope your students will gain from being in your class this year?

Self-Understanding

1. How do you envision yourself as a teacher and a teacher for multicultural students in the future?
2. How has race played in your life?
3. What, if any, and how have you been privileged and marginalized in the life?
4. How would you describe your cultural identity?

Understanding of Social Relations

1. How do you view multicultural students and other non-native Koreans in the society? Are there any difference in your perspective since you have had multicultural students?

2. What are your perspectives about the educational and social system in our society? Are there any difference in your perspective since you have had multicultural students?

Appendix B

HYPOTHETICAL SCENARIOS FOR INTERVIEWS

These scenarios were taken from case studies in the extant literature on South Korea's multicultural education. However, I adapted them slightly to elaborate the situations.

Scenario #1

There is a student in your class who was born to a Korean father and a Vietnamese mother. One day at the beginning of the year, the mother came to school. She was fluent in Korean and asked you not to mention her son's multicultural background to his classmates. She said he was born in Korea, and they both have Korean citizenship. She told you that he transferred from another school because his peers bullied him due to his biracial background. She wants you to keep his racial background secret and never mention multicultural issues to the class (Seo, 2010).

Scenario #2

You have a multicultural student; you may know she has a multicultural background due only to some aspect of her appearance, like her skin color. She speaks Korean as well as other Koreans. Everything looks the same as with other students, and you don't see any difference from her. Reflecting on recent class days, you have not felt any need to teach her from a cultural perspective. She is one student just like the others.

Even though you have never met her parents, this is fine because she is doing average work (Hwang, Ko, & Kim, 2010).

Scenario #3

There is a student in your class from a binational marriage. From her appearance, you may assume that her family belongs to a low-income group. She is competent at the Korean language, but still struggles to fully understand the lessons. She performs poorly on tests, and doesn't complete her homework. It seems she is not interested in the lessons. Whenever you talk to her, she says she will do better next time. Yet, there has been no change. Moreover, recently she has been often absent from school. You have been not able to contact her parents (Jang & Jeon, 2013).

Scenario #4

You have a multicultural student. He is the son of a migrant worker family from Sri Lanka, and his parents are undocumented foreigners. Even though he attends class, his parents never show up at school due to their illegal status. Because he came to South Korea when he was in 2nd grade, his Korean language skills are very poor. He doesn't engage in lessons and gets low scores on tests. His low achievement is factored into your teacher and school evaluations. He has trouble with peers and shows some violent behaviors. There have been complaints from other parents against him. Now, the principal has told you to send him to another school, which is not an official school but an alternative institution for multicultural students (Yeom, 2009).

Scenario #5

You have a multicultural student. You have tried to help him to adapt to the school environment. You have paid additional attention to him and individually taught him. When conflicts arise between him and other students, you often scold other native Korean students and ask them to give in to him. However, recently, you have begun to feel that he has become accustomed to being cared for and always expects others' help. You think he depends on others too much. It seems he thinks that he can be excused all the time due to his multicultural status. Moreover, other students complain that you don't care about them as much as the multicultural student. Some students feel jealous of him (Hwang, Ko, & Kim, 2010).

Appendix C

A SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT-TEACHERS' SOCIOCULTURAL UNDERSTANDING

	Sae-Ra	Do-Jin
Self – Understanding	·A superior and high qualified ·Korean	·An efficient and altruistic ·Korean
Race	·White superiority ·Racism based on national economic rank	·White and Korean superiority ·Racism ·Racial stereotypes
Class (SES)	·Hierarchism ·Abnormal-deficit thinking ·The most critical factor of a person's status	·Low class people as social losers
Social system	·Blinded	·Unequal but unchangeable
Attribution of Achievement	·Own competence and effort vs parental supports	·Social capital (Parents' merit) ·Having strength within the system
Multiculturalism	·Hostility	·Damage to social quality
Multicultural Family	·From underdeveloped countries ·Threat to social security (security risk) ·Disdainful	·A deal between losers
Assistance policy	·Discontent ·Grudge	·Useless
Multicultural students	·Others but also just one of the Korean students	·Inherently deficient
Barriers for Multicultural Students	·Nothing except bullying due to skin color	·Racism in society ·Bullying due to skin color ·Linguistic developmental delay and low achievement due to absence of parental support
Multicultural Education		·Prevention education ·Teaching self-esteem

	Seong	Yoo-Jeong
Self – Understanding	·A star who strives to shine ·Korean	·An elite Chinese Woman
Race	·White supremacy ·Racism as a human instinct ·Racial hierarchy based on national economic rank	·Racial hierarchy based on national economy and educational quality
Class (SES)	·Stereotypes ·Deficit thinking (lack of knowledge)	·Tax payers responsible for social spending; being extorted by benefit recipients
Social system	·Indifferent	·Unequal but unchangeable ·Protective of her own family's gains and losses
Attribution of Achievement	·Personal effort vs family support and mother's attention	·Social capital (family support) ·Catching up within the system
Multiculturalism	·Indifferent ·Rejection	
Multicultural Family	·Wives, coming without love ·Husbands, socially backward	·Based on money ·Poor ·Uneducated ·Low social status
Assistance policy	·Ineffective	·Causing social debt
Multicultural students	·Low achieving ·Tactless in the context of Korean culture	·Not naturally deficient but disadvantaged due to lack of opportunity ·Not all low achieving
Barriers for Multicultural Students	·Absence of parental support, such as mothers' disinterest in education and miscommunication with mothers ·Bullying due to skin color	·Vocabulary learning ·Bullying due to skin color ·Absence of parental support
Multicultural Education	·Not my responsibility, but can be done by other sources	·No segregation for assimilation

Appendix D

THE PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENT INTRODUCED IN SEONG'S COLLEGE CLASS

All of these are skin colors.

Migrant workers are also precious humans who have different skin colors.
They are valuable visitors who will report about our nation after going back.

Our ethnicity knows about the sorrow of week nation better than anyone else.
We still feel sad for the Japanese colonial period.
Thus, we feel very sorry for the news about violation of migrant workers' human rights.
It is the time to show again our virtue as the country of courteous people to the precious visitors.

Korea Broadcast Advertising Corp. (2001)

Appendix E

THE LIFE HISTORIES OF THE FOUR PARTICIPANTS IN KOREAN

세라

저는 올 해 28 살이구요. 아버지는 은행 다니시고 어머니는 초등학교 선생님이신 부모님 밑에서 태어나 자랐어요. 저는 저희 가족이 중산층 보다 위인 거 같아요. 왜냐면 부족한 거 없이 자랐고 저는 잘 아낄줄도 모르고. 그냥 좋으신 부모님 만나서그래서 아무 문제 없이 잘 자랐던 거 같아요.

엄마랑 같은 학교 다녔구요, 저 초등학교 때 반장을 항상 했어요. 2 학년 때부터 6 학년때까지. 엄마가 선생님으로 있으니깐 아무래도 이래저래 잘 챙겨주셨지만, 저도 열심히 했던 것 같아요. 못 하면 안 되잖아요 엄마가 선생님이니깐. 그래서 잘해야지 잘해야지. 저는 어쨌거나 중학교, 그리고 고 1 때까지 반장을 쭉 했잖아요. 약간, 앞에 나서는 거 좋아하고 계속 앞에서 뭔가 하는 거 좋아했어요. 그렇게 오래 반장 한다는 게 쉬운 일이 아니잖아요. 그런게 나름 기록이라 해야하나 약간 자랑스럽기도 해요. 사실, 엄마가 엄청 많이 공부를 챙겨주신 건 아니에요. 엄마가 일하시니깐 많이 못 챙겨주는 부분도 있고. 선수학습만 하라고 시키셨지, 엄마가 붙잡고 공부를 시킨다거나 이러지는 않았어요. 들어가서 공부해 이런식으로 엄마가 저를 시험이라고 따로 케어해주고 이런 건 없었어요. 6 학년 때 조선족인 학생이 한 명 저희 반에 있었거든요. 너무 더러워서, 그 때 기억으로는 제가 정말 싫어했어요. 내가 좀 못되게 굴었다는 생각도 들어요. 말이나 이런거는 한국 사람처럼 했는데, 이름부터 달랐고 성도 아니였구요. 그 당시에는 다문화 뭐 그런게 없었는데 그냥 깨끗하지 않았다로

기억해요. 지금에서야 아, 걔가 다문화였구나 생각들죠. 그 친구가 유일하게 다문화였어요.

저는 사립고(자립형사립고) 갔었어요. 시내에서 3 퍼센트 안에 든 애들만 갈 수 있었고 물론 저도 그래서 갔죠. 그런데, 저는 못 따라가겠더라구요. 그래서 그냥 중간정도만 했어요. 공부 잘 하는 애들, 날고 기는 애들, 쟤들은 꺾을 수 없는 애들이구나, 태어날 때부터 머리가 좋은 애들, 이런 애들은 아무리 해도 제가 이기지 못하겠더라요. 능력이 다르니깐요. 그래도 좋게 좋게 생각하는 편이에요. '내가 다른 학교 갔으면 분명히 잘 했을거야, 그 학교였으니깐 중간정도 했다' 이렇게 생각하면서 좌절하지는 않았어요. 학교 나름으로의 자부심, 그나마 그 학교 나왔다는 거, 그 자부심으로 좋게 생각하고 있어요. 고 1 때, 제가 친구들한테서 한 번 따돌림 당했던 적이 있어요. 저는 완전 충격이었어요. 저는 친구들이 저를 좋아한다고 생각했는데. 이때까지도 그렇게 계속 살아왔는데. 그런 일을 겪어서 정말 충격이어서 하루종일 펑펑 울었던 거 기억나요. 그 때 반장을 하면서 나서는 거 좋아하니깐, 그게 밋보였던 거 같아요. 너무 설치고 나대려고 했었죠. 그 이후로는 안하려 했어요. 그 때 이후로, 학교에서 왕따 당하는 애를 보면 당하는 애 심정도 이해는 하는데, 저는 내가 겪어봐서 아니깐, '분명히 저 아이도 문제가 있는 거다'라고 생각이 들어요. 고등학교 추억 중에, 제가 고등학교 때 역사를 정말 못했어요. 인문계인데 국사 점수가 너무 형편이 없는 거에요. 그래서 제가 마음먹고 한두달 정말 빠짝 팠어요. 그 이후로 국사가 늘 다 맞고 잘 나오는 거에요. 그 때 한 번 성취감을 느꼈고, 이렇게 하나를 파면 나는 되는구나 이걸 느꼈어요.

어릴 때부터 나도 초등학교 선생님되어야지 생각해어요. (아무래도 엄마의 영향이 있었겠죠.) 그게 쭉 이어졌고 결국은 마지막에 교대로 왔어요. 엄마가 영어교육과가 전망이 좋다고 해서 영어교육 전공했어요. 그렇게 갔는데 결론적으로 영어교육과 사람들이 영어를 굉장히 잘 하니깐 상대적으로 저는

못하게됐어요. 저희 엄마도 저 어릴 때부터 영어를 시키셨는데, 저는 친구들만큼 잘 하지 못했어요. 다른 사람들은 발음이 유창하고 나랑은 영어를 말하는게 너무 다른 거에요, 회화가 될정도로. 나도 늘 잘한다 했던 아이였는데, 영어로는 기를 죽고 살았어요. 별로 좋지 않았어요. 하지만, 역시나 우리 과가 워낙 잘 하니깐, 고등학교때처럼 좋게 생각한 편이에요. 제가 기억하는 또다른 건, 제가 대학교 4 학년 때 영어연극을 감독했던 거에요. 지금도 아주 뿌듯해요. 제가 1 학기동안 열정 아닌 열정을 쏟아 부었었고, 결국 세팀이 나오는데 가장 잘하는 팀으로 뽑혔어요. 정말 좋았고, 전 지금도 '나 영어 연극 연출했었어' 하는 그런게 있어요. 3 학년 때 과외를 했었어요. 저는 사실 과외를 하기 싫었어요. 사실 전 과외 필요성을 못 느꼈는데, 엄마가 너도 한 번 해라해서 '용돈 끊지 마라'는 조건으로 했어요. 엄마 용돈 주시는거에 과외비까지 들어오는 거에요. 다 썼죠. 풍족하게 썼어요. 그런 재미로 과외를 계속 했던 거 같애요.

임용고시 치기 전에, 00 도로 갈지, 00 광역시로 갈지 진짜 고민을 많이 했어요. 엄마가 계신 곳으로 가고도 싶었지만, 00 도로 치면 어디로 떨어질지 모르잖아요. 저는 그게 너무 싫은 거에요. 대도시에 살고 싶다는 꿈이 컸고 그래서 광역시로 시험을 쳤어요. 합격 후에 첫 해에 영어전담, 그리고 5 학년 4 학년 담임을 했어요. 올 해는 2 학년 맡고 있어요. 영어전담 때 3 명의 다문화 학생이 있었고, 담임으로는 올해 처음으로 다문화애 맡아요. 그 전에는 다문화 애가 없었어요. 제 주변에 아는 사람으로는, 엄마 친척 중에, 6 촌인가 7 촌 중에 한 분 있어요. 그 분은 시골에 있는데, 40-50 대에 국제결혼했어요. 신부를 베트남에서 데려왔는데 제 나이인거에요. 근데 이게 자랑할 일은 아니잖아요. 그래서 그 시어머니가 며느리를 거의 집에만 있게 한다는 얘기 들으니깐, 불쌍하더라구요.

이 학교에서 지금 맡고 있는 업무는 영재반이에요. 가르치기는 수월해서 좋아요. 영재학급이 조금 더 수월하긴 한 게잘 따라오고. 말귀를 잘 알아듣거든요.

이렇게 문제를 제시하면 잘 해결해요. 반에서는 부진아들이 있으니깐, 이해를 못하니깐 뭘 가르쳐야 하는지도 모르겠는데, 영재 학급은 그런 애들이 없으니깐 지도하기 좀 더 나은 거 같애요. 부진아 지도하는 게 그렇게 힘들더라구요..

지금, 아동 및 유아교육 전공으로 석사과정 하고 있어요. 벌써 끝난 친구들 보면, '빨리 했어야 했는데, 더 빨리 했으면 더 나았을텐데' 그런 생각도 많이 들어요. 저희 엄마랑 외삼촌, 초등학교 교장선생님이셨거든요, 두 분이 석사 하라고, 빨리 하면 좋다고 하면서 영어과 가라고 계속 그러셨는데, 전 영어가 너무 싫은 거에요. 그렇게 스트레스 받으면서 하기는 싫은 거에요. 그래서 유아교육, 저학년과 연결되는 걸 했어요. 대학원은 다 좋아요. 그런데 초등교사들만 들어오는 게 아니라서, 그건 별로에요.

교사로서는 되개 만족하는 거 같아요. 월급이 다른 직장보다 많지는 않아도 일한 만큼 받고 내 시간 있고, 방학도 있으니깐 그런데서 만족을 얻는 거 같아요. 저는 여행 좋아해요. 이번 여름에 유럽가요. 사실 갖다 온지 2 년밖에 안됐는데, 친구가 가자 하니깐 가요. 사실 저는 여름에 걸릴 것도 없고, 해야 하는 게 없으니깐 가자 했어요. 이거라도 해야지. 그런데, 해외 여행 다녀보면, 우리 나라가 진짜 살기 좋은 곳이구나 생각들어요.

결혼해야죠. 부모님도 애 닳아 하시고 압박을 받고 있어요. 좋은 사람 있으면 소개해주세요. 교회 다니고, 집안 좋고, 학벌도 좋으면 좋겠어요. 우리 집하고 비슷하게는 살았으면 좋겠어요. 능력있는 사람. 학교도 좋은 데 나와서 대기업 다니는 사람. 제가 좀 까다롭나요? 그래도, 집안이랑 직장 둘 다 포기 못하겠어요. 제 친구들은 다 의사나 대기업 사람들과 결혼했거든요.

도진

올해로 43 살, 20 년차야. 난 시골에서 태어나 자랐고 그 때 우린 못 살았었지. 말 그대로 밥 먹고 사는 정도, 저소득층이었어. 그래도 그 당시에는 못 느꼈어 왜냐면 그 동네가 다 고만고만 했으니깐. 학생일때는자신감도 없었고 초등학교때는 좀 공부를 못하는 학생이었어. 중학교 갔을 때, 시험쳤을 때 55 명 주에 33 등 했어. 그리고 나서는, 성적이 계속 올랐지. 내 생각에는 중학교 2 학년때부터 공부를 좀 해야겠다는 의지가 있었던 거 같아. 그래서 고등학교 입학 할 때는, 그래도 그 시내에서 명문고에 가려고 했고, 그래도 잘 한 편이었어.

내가 교대 간 거는, 몇 가지 이유가 있었지. 먼저, 내가 3 학년때부터 교회를 다녔는데, 내가 보니깐 믿는사람이 주일성수 할 수 있는 직장을 생각해봤는데, 교사가 최고로 낫더라구. 또 누나가 교사였어. 누나가 추천할만하다고, 안정적이고 세속적으로 봐도 좋다고. 게다가 우리 어머니도내 성격을 보고 너는 교사가 최고다라고 옛날부터 생각을 했어. 가정형편이 어려웠기 때문에, 일반대학교 보내기로는 조금 버거웠고 또 부모님도 장남이 경제적으로 안정되어있었으면 하고 바랬고. 나는 선택을 정말 잘 했다고 생각해. 가장 잘한 선택이다.

광역시에서 7 년 일하고 2002 년에 8 년차부터 00 군으로 옮겼어. 점수때문에 옮겼지. 그 학교가 교사문화가 굉장히 달랐어, 뭐 거의 군대같은. 근데 내가 그걸 잘 몰랐던 거지, 그래서 선배들한테서 미움을 많이 받았지. 나중에 그 걸 들었어. 4 년 후에 다시 한 번 더 안쪽으로 더 들어갔어. 그 학교는 일본 엄마들 다문화애들이 많았어. 통일교로 연결돼서 국제결혼 한 사람들이야 전부. 그런데 그 학교가 다문확육을 잘 했어. 그 엄마들 불러다가 요리 교실도 열고 교사랑 저녁에 따로 모임도 가지게 해주고. 우리 반에도 다문화애가 둘 있었어. 그

때까지는 다문화라하면 인순이, 윤수일 이야기만 들었지, 다른 건 없었지. 그 엄마들은 교육열이 대단했고 애들도 잘 했어. 사실, 가장 당황스럽다고 해야 하나 좀 힘들었던 때가, 5 학년 역사를 가르치면서 한국이 일본을 무찔렀다하고 내가 신나서 설명하다가 걔들이랑 눈이 딱 마주치는거야. 아니면 독립운동 설명할 때, 뭐 그냥 대충 얼버무리지 뭐.

내가 지역점수 다 채우고, 2010 년에 이 학교로 왔어. 여기 오기 전에, 이미 교감이랑 다 연구부장하는 걸로 얘기가 됐지. 내가 전에 같이 근무했었던 분이라나 좀 댕겨달라고 했거든. 부장 자리가 확실해지고 여기로 왔지. 내가 다른 점수는 다 채운 상태였으니깐. 여기서는, 연구부장 3 년하고 올 해는 교무부장이야. 이제 점수 다 모았거든, 그러니깐, 몇 년 안에 교감지명 받는다고 봐야지. 이게 굉장히 빠른 거지. 동기들 중에 점수로 해가지고 된다고하면 400 명 중에서 10 번째 중에 들겠다. 지금까지 내 인생에서 뭐 그렇게 심각한 난관은 없었던 것 같아. 너무 곧고 평탄하게 살았지 않나 싶어. 난 한 번씩, 내가 어떻게 하면 위험을 막을 수 있는지 그런 생각을 많이 하지. 내가 맨날 그런 생각하지는 않지만 내가 한 번씩 돌아봐. 그래서 미리 이렇게 저렇게 잘 대비하는 스타일이기도 하고.

보직은, 정말 교무부장으로 일하는 거, 연구부장에 비하면 정말 좋아, 사실 아무것도 아니야. 일은 연구부장에 비하면 정말 조금인데, 대우는 거의 준교감급이거든. 사실 업무로 힘들지 않는데, 사실 교무부장이 샘들을 많이 대해야한다는건데, 나는 샘들의 필요를 잘 채워주니깐. 교무부장으로서, 나는 그냥 꼭 필요하고 유용한 것들 제공해드리고 불필요한 일들은 줄이는거야. 그리고 난 남교사로 또 좋아. 남자교사로 부장을 맡는 건 정말 아주 이득인 것 같아. 내가 카리스마스도 있고 온유함도 있기 때문에 여선생님들이 나를 그냥 좋은 오빠처럼 대하지.

난 사회과로 석사했는데, 그 해 2002 년에 결혼했어. 아내는 고등학교 교사야. 우리 맞벌이지만, 우리는 아직 다른 부부교사처럼 중산층은 아닌 것 같아. 우리는 양가 부모님들 용돈 드리고 또 교회도 다니니깐. 그런데 이제 곧 결국에는 중산층의 삶을 살지 않을까 싶어. 내 아내도 곧 승진할 거거든. 내가 우리 부모님 노후 문제도 완전 해결했지. 아버지가 지금 아무것도 안 하시거든, 그래서 우리가 돈을 보내셔야 해. 그래서 누나랑 동생이랑 해서 기금 조성하고 거기 이자랑 해서 돈을 맞춰 보내. 내가 보니 방법이 이거밖에 없겠다. 이렇게 하자. 그럼 엄마는 불안하지는 않잖아. 그랬더니 누나들도 좋다 하고, 나도 정말 잘 했다고 생각해.

내가 교사로 잘 하는 것도, 그리고 승진하는 것도 중요하고 신경을 쓴다고는 하지만, 사실그게 그렇게 큰 거는 아니야. 어짜피 퇴임하고 나면 다 비슷하니깐. 사실, 나한테 제일 중요한 건, 내 딸이야. 지금 4 학녀인데, 나는 딸을 제일 좋아하거든. 인생에서 딸 만난 게 가장 좋아. 지금 4 학년. 우리 딸이 쓸모있는 인간이 되어 세상에서 날개펴며 가는 거 보고 싶은 게 꿈이지. 내 딸이 늘 제일 우선순위야. 나는 딸이 잘 되는 게 제 일순위야. 내가 걔 태어나서 7 살까지 거의 애들 엄마가, 아줌마들이 하는 거 처럼 했어. 애 키우는 거에만 올인했지. 4 살때까지 열심히 같이 놀아주고 5 세때 한글을 떼게하고 6 세때 덧셈 뺄셈을 가르치고 7 세때 2 학년 2 학기를 다 끝냈어. 병설유치원으로 데리고 다니고 2 학년 때까지 계속 같이 다녔어. (3 학년 때부터 집 가까운 학교로 옮겼어.) 지금도 난 독서, 영어, 수학을 내가 잡고 시켜. 책 읽고 나면 같이 토로하고 수학도 훨씬 앞에 거 시키고. 영어는, 4 살때부터 영어비디오 보여주고 8 살부터 영어회화를 전화로 하는 걸로 시켰어. 지금은 중학교 영어 해. 전화 영어는 이제 좀 더 시간을 늘리려고 생각 중이야. 영어는 사실 학력에 가장 중요한 과목이니깐 해 줘야지. 나한테는 걔가 성공하는 거 보는 거 외에는 다른 게 없어.

친구 중 한 명이, 내 나이지, 중국 여자랑 결혼했는데, 제작년에 결혼해서 다음해에 이혼했어. 시골에 사는데, 형편이 넉넉하지 못하지. 한국 예쁜 여자들은 자기가 봐도 명함을 못 건네는 거지. 다 나이든 여자뿐이 없고. 그래서 중국여자, 22 살, (좀 문제가 있지?)랑 했지. 근데 그 여자가 서구적인거야. 아무것도 안 하고 소파에 누워있어. 몇 마디 나누고 자기 방에가서 게임하고 음악듣고. 내 친구가 득을 보는 건 하나도 없는거야. 사실, 결혼이라는 게 서로 이득이 있어야 유지되는 건데, 그러면 결혼 생활을 계속 할 이유가 없잖아. 내가 처음에 그랬어, 한 4 년 살다가 애 가지라고, 그런데 그 게 진짜 잘 했다 싶어. 만약 애라도 있었으면 어쩔뻔 했어?

여기 학교에서, 나는 담임을 안 하지 왜냐면 부장을 맡으니깐. 계속 교과 전담 했는데, 도덕, 음악, 영어 했었어. 올 해 다시 음악하는데 3-5 학년 가르치지. 나는 개인적으로 음악이 너무 좋아. 음악 가르치는 것도 좋고 앞으로도, 교감 발령 받기 전까지는 담임 할 바에야 음악 전담 계속 할 거야.

성

저는 아주 시골 중에서도 시골에서 태어났어요. 할머니 할아버지가 농사를 지어가지고. 부모님은 계속 그 시골에 계세요. 저는 계속 못살았던 거 같아요. 항상 그렇게 생각하고 있어요. 농촌에서.. 그러니깐.. 부모님도 농업을 하시니깐 그렇게 수입이 많지 않았어요. 그런데, 항상 부족했지만 저는 쓰고 싶은 건 다 쓰고 살았던 거 같아요. 돌아보면, 자연과 벗삼아 그렇게 시골에 살았던 게 참 좋았던 거 같아요. 그래서 그런지 많은 창의성이 발달 한 거 같아요. 저희 아버지가 이름을 별이라는 뜻을 담아 성으로 지어주셨어요. 아버지는 굉장히 학구적이시고 어머니도 꾸미고 하는 그런 재주가 좋으세요.

저는 초등학교를한 학년이 한 반인 작은데 다녔거든요. 18 명이 한 반이었고 6 년 내내 같은 반이었어요. 저는 초등학교 6 년 막 내내 내가 하고 싶은 말 하고 가족같으니깐 자유스럽게 발표하는 게 당연했어요. 맨날 손들고 발표하고. 계속 반장했었어요. 시골에서는 마구 공부 시키고 그런거 잘 없잖아요, 그래서 도시 애들처럼 스트레스 없었고, 당연히 시험 그런 거 잘 몰랐어요. 하지만 아빠가 약간 학업에 관심이 많으셔서 공부를 시키시고, 저도 열심히해서 계속 잘 했던 것 같아요. 그런데 중학교를 도시로 가면서 성적이 갑자기 확 떨어지잖아요. 이상하다고 충격받다가, 다시 열심히 해서 성적을 올렸죠. 고등학교 때도 떨어졌다가 어 이상하네 또 올리고. 처음에 떨어졌다가 다시 열심히 해서 바로 다음부터 올리고 그랬어요. 고등학교 때 성적으로 12 명 안에 들어서 학교 기숙사도 들어갔어요. 늘 그랬던 거 같아요. 처음에 못하다가 그 다음에 열심히 해서 잘 하고. 전반적으로, 저는 모범생이었구요, 그냥 공부는 열심히 잘 했던 거 같아요. 상도 많이 받았고.

저는 발표를 잘 하고, 약간 이끌어가고 남들 앞에서 나서서 뭐 하는 거 좋아했어요. 학교 행사가 있으면 사회를 본다던가 뭐 장기자랑을 가서 하고 했죠. 또 학생회 같은 거 많이 해가지고, 다른 학교 친구들이랑도 교류를 많이 했어요. 친구들이랑 친하게 지내고 다양한 활동을 많이 했거든요. 저는 특별한 학생이였어요. 특이하다는 이야기 많이 들었어요. 개성이 강하다 이런 거. 얼마전에 전국노래자랑도 나갔어요. 제 대학동기 두 명이랑 몇 주 전에 나가서 인기상 받았어요. 교감선생님께는 나간다고 말씀드렸는데, 후폭풍이 걱정이에요. 그래도 tv 에는 우리가 생각했던 것보다 좀 차분하고 조용하게 나와서 다행이다 했어요. 그리고 학교에 딱 한 분만 tv 를 봤다고 하더라구요. (웃음)

늘 제 주변 사람들은 저보고 교사하라고 햇어요. 가르치는게 제 성격이랑 딱 맞다고, 그리고 잘 할거라고 했어요. 제가 초등학교 때부터 친구들이 뭐

물어오면 친절하게 잘 가르쳐줬거든요. 다른 데 지원했다가 떨어지고 재수해서 교대로 갔어요. 09 학번이에요. 교대에서도 학점은 열심히 관리했어요. 수업은 열심히 들었던 거 같아요. 또 발표 하는 거 좋아해서, 뭐 대부분 거의 그런 수업이니깐, 저한테 수업은 잘 맞았던 거 같아요. 제가 노력도 엄청 했어요. 맨날 조과제를 해야하는데, 사실 저는 완벽하게 해내려는 성격 때문에 남들이 해 온 거 보면 마음에 안 들어하거든요. 그래서 제가 다시 다 새로 하는 편이거든요. 그래서 그런 거 때문에 제가 스트레스 많이 받아가지고 울고 그랬죠. 그래도 마음에 안 들면 다시 다 했어요. 제 성격이 그래요.

실습을 부설초에서 했어요. 부설초는 선생님들이 다 정말 잘 하시고 다들 훌륭하신 분들만 계시잖아요. 그리고 거기가 제일 빡세게 시키거기로 유명하거든요. 이왕에 배울거면 잘 배우자 싶어서 제가 거기로 지원했어요. 실은, 대부분 친구들이 거기로 가는 걸 싫어해요, 대신 진짜 독한 애들만 지원하거든요. (웃음) 2 주동안 저는 매일 새벽에 자고 하면서 진짜 열심히 했어요. 그런데도수업 준비를 엄청 많이 하는 애들이 거기로 다 오니깐, 제가 아무리 엮심히 하고 준비를 해도 저는 제가 잘 한다는 느낌을 못 받겠는거에요. 너무 약간, 좀 불성실하다는 소리도 듣구요. ,..저는 동기들 사이에서 못하는 애가 됐어요. 별로 성실하지 않은 애로 찍히기까지 하구요. 그 실습 기간이 너무 힘들었어요.

대학 때, 사물놀이 동아리에 들었어요. 시간이 정말 많이 뺏겼어요. 매일 공연 연습하고 방학 때마다 길게 전수가고 주말에도 공연때문에 연습하구요. 진짜 힘들었는데, 진짜 힘들었거든요. 근데 친구들이 너무 좋아서 의리로 남았어요. 동아리 활동 때문에 러시아도 교육봉사활동하러 갔었어요. 거기 한국인들한테 한국 문화랑 전통 뮤직도 가르쳐주고 공연도 하고 했어요.

대학 때, 진짜 바빴는데도, 용돈 쓰려고 과외도 했어요. 한 번은 대학교 통해서 하는 거였는데, 저소득층이나 다문화 학생들 대상으로 과외하는 거였어요.

저는 다문화 학생을 직접 가르치진 않았는데, 제 옆테이블에 다른 대학생이 다문화 학생 가르치는 걸 봤어요. 그게 처음 본 거에요. 외국인 처럼 생겨서 우와 신기하다고 봤는데, 말하는 건 완전 한국학생이니깐 완전 좀 충격이었어요. 진짜 놀래서 잊혀지지가 않아요.

올 2 월에 졸업하고 3 월에 바로 발령받았어요. 실습을 제외하고는 여기서 일하는 게 처음이에요. 저는 처음에는 매일 애들 챙기고 수업이랑 그런거 맨날 맨날 준비하고 정말 그거에 올인할 줄 알았는데, 그게 아니더라구요. 제가 좀 더 잘 할 수 있고 또 해야 하는 것 같은데. 제가 좀 더 준비하고 열심히 했으면 애들도 좀 재밌어하고 집중도 할텐데 맨날 그게 안되니깐, 맨날 맨날 후회하고 애들한테 미안해요. 제가 더 열심히 해야할 것 같아요. 제가 더 노력해야죠. 너무 게으른 것 같아요. 지금은 먼지가 가득 쌓인 별같아요. 제 이름처럼 저 이러지 않았는데, 요즘은 그냥 평범해지는 것 같아요.

유정

우리 할아버지 3-4 살 때, 증조부가 한국 회령에서 중국 연변으로 국경을 건넜어요. 증조부랑 가족들 모두 거기에 정착을 했고, 제 할아버지는 거기서 똑같이 국경 건너 온 한국 여자랑 결혼을 했지요. 아버지는 거기서 태어나시고. 우리 아버지가 어렸을 때, 할아버지가 심양으로 옮기셨어요. 베이징 옆에 굉장히 큰 도시에요. 그 때 부터 우리 가족은 계속 거기서 살았어요. 우리 할아버지가 수완이 좋으셔서, 금방 자리도 잡았고 잘 살았다고 들었어요. 사실, 심양에는 가난한 사람이 없었어요. 거기는 다 잘 살았어요 쌀 농사를 지으니깐. 우리 아버지도 연변 여자인, 조선족 여자랑 결혼했고 저랑 제 오빠 낳았죠.

우리 부모님은 너희는조선사람이다 그런 의식이 강해서 조선말 하게 시키셨어요. 엄마는 아직 중국말 잘 못해요. 저는 조선족 학교를 고등학교까지 다 나왔어요. 우리 동네는 조선족이 5 가정밖에 없고 다 한족이어서 나가면 중국말하고 집에 가면 조선말했죠. 어릴 때는 한족 애들이랑 많이 싸웠죠. 조선족이라고 놀리니깐. 그럼, 무조건 이겨야 해요. 안 그러면, 한 번 밀리면 다른 한족 애들이 다 같이 놀리기 때문에. 그래도, 저 어릴 때 빼면 뭐 그런 걸로 문제는 없었어요. 왜냐면 심양이 큰 도시라서 조선족, 한족 구분이 없었어요. 연변은 있지, 거기는 차별이 좀 있죠. 저는 중국사람이다 해요. 조선족 학교를 다녔지만, 난 중국인이다. 거기서도 내가 중국사람이다고 가르쳐요. 그냥 조선족인 '중국인'이다라고. 중국이 "너 계속 너희 말 써라, 너희는 소수민족이니깐. 하지만 너희 근원은 중국이다"라고 가르쳐요. 어릴 때 교육이 강하게 남잖앙요. 계속 중국인이다 생각했죠. 한국 역사는 학교에서 별로 안 배웠어요. 유럽, 미국, 일본 역사는 배웠는데, 뭐 한국은 작으니깐 그 만큼 안 중요하다 그런 거겠죠.

재료공학 전공해서 대학 다녔어요. 졸업 후에는 엔지니어로 회사에서 일했죠. 92 년에 한중수교가 이뤄지고 한국 기업들이 중국으로 많이 들어왔어요. 그 때 회사에서 한국인 남편 만났죠. 중국에서 결혼식 올리고 93 년 8 월 1 일에 한국와서 그 달 20 일에 국적변경했어요. 그 당시에는 지금처럼 국제결혼이 유행 안했기 때문에, 그래서 사람들이 막 이상한 나라에 간다 하면서 그랬어요. 중국에는 남조선에 대해 별로 안 좋은 인상이 있었어요. '금이랑 은이랑' 영화가 있는데, 은이는 남쪽에 끌려가 다리 다치고 다 술집에 팔리고 고생하는 영화를 봤어요. 그런 식으로 북한은 아이가 행복하게 살고 음악가가 됐는데 남한은 안 좋게 비춰졌죠. 그래서 저도 그랬고 우리 식구들도 다 남조선 사람이랑 결혼한다는 걸 다 무서워하고 마음을 못 놓았어요. 그 때 남편이 결혼하면 남한 잠깐 방문만 했다가 다시 중국에서 살거라고 약속했으니깐 국제 결혼했지. 근데 그 약속 안

지키고, 지금 20 년동안 여기서만 살고 있잖아요. 또, 시부모가 너무 잘 해주셔가지고 가서 고생시키고 뭐 그렇게 할건 아니라하면서시 그래서, 시부모 보고 했죠. 그리고 잘 사는 거 알고 왔지, 안 그랬으면 안 왔죠. 지금도 남편이 건물 세 받고 살지. 부모님이 많이 도와줬어요.

난 애가 둘이에요. 첫째는 아들이고 대학생인데 지금은 군대 가 있어요. 둘째는 여고생이에요. 둘 다 어렸을 때는 집에서 중국말 했어요. 근데, 내가 우리 아들이 유치원갔는데 뭔 말인지 몰라하는 걸 보고 나서 그냥 한국말 했어요. 걔가 처음에 공부를 엄청 못하는 거야, 제가 충격받고 붙잡고 열심히 가르쳤죠. 그러니깐 또 금방 잘 하는 거에요. 대학에서도 장학금 받는데, 그 과에서 주는 제일 큰 장학금이래요. 걔네들 조선족이라는 것 때문에 뭐 문제 생기는 건 없었던 것 같아요. 가까운 이웃들은 어짜피 내가 중국에서 온 거 다 아니깐. 내가 억양이 튀니깐, 금방 알아봐요. 그러니깐 내가 먼저 말하죠. 안 그러면 이상한 소문이나 날 수 있으니깐.

남편이랑 시집에서는 나 밖에 나가서 일 못하게 했어요. 그냥 구속받고 계속 집에 있었죠. 그리고 내가 일 할 수 있는 자리도 없었고. 아는 사람들 소개로 중국어 조금씩 가르치긴 했지만, 이렇게 나와서 일하는 건 상상도 못 했죠. 애들도 크고 나도 한국 생활 적응되고 나서는 헬스장이랑 수영장 다니면서 시간만 죽이고 있었는데, 어느날 시에서 하는 문화센터 홈페이지를 보는데, 다문화 여성을 위한 무료 강좌가 있다는 거야. 그래서 거기 가면서, 내가 처음으로 다문화랑 관련되기 시작했지. 이 수업을 찾은 기회때문에 다른 것도 있다는 거 알게 되고.

그 해 여름에 다문화강사 양성 과정을 듣고, 그건 교육청에서 해 주는 거였어요. 그 거 마칠 때, 교육청에서 전화가 와서 이중언어강사 자리가 있다고 지원하라고 하는 거야, 그래서 지원했죠. 난 그 때 그런 자리가 있는지도 몰랐죠. 운 좋게도 돼서, 교육청에서 이 학교로 발령을 내 줬어요. 올 해가 세번째해에요.

이 학교 13 명 다문화 학생 있는데, 중국, 북한, 그리고 필리핀 엄마들 애들이에요. 내가 중국에서 왔으니깐, 아무래도 중국애들한테 더 정이 가는 건 사실이에요. 이번 학기 부터는 한 애 통역해주는 도우미 같은 그런 일도 해요. 그러니깐, 이 학교랑 두 가지 자리로 계약되어있어요.

운 좋게도, 이번 봄 부터 교대에서 중국어 강사로 일 하고 있어요. 거기에 닥 한 자리 있었는데, 교대에서 이중언어강사 전부 다 한테 공지를 보냈어요. 처음에는 서류 심사하고 인터뷰도 본다고 했는데, 인텁 없이 그냥 거기서 저한테 결과를 통보했어요. 합격했다고. 서류로, 이력서랑 학위증이랑 연수 이수증 냈거든요. 아이고 지루하게 널널하게 살다가 정신없이 바빠지니 적응도 잘 안되요. 그래도 계속 해야죠. 어떻게 잡은 기회인데. 다음 학기에도 계속 하면 좋겠는데, 대학에서 연락오길 기다리고 있어요.

우리 식구들도 다 좋아하죠. 남편은 맨날 나보고 일 그만두라고, 왜냐면 이 자리가 돈은 정말 얼마 안 되거든요. 진짜 적어요. 근데, 대학에서 가르친다고 하니깐 이제 좋아하는 거 같아요. 제 딸도 진짜 좋아해요. 한 번은 친구들한테 우리 엄마가 대학에서 일한다 했나봐. 그랬더니 다들 저기 실업대학 그런데서 하는 줄 아는 거야. 그래서 딸이 아니다 교대다 했더니, 애들이 다르게 보더라고. 여기가 교대는 높게 쳐준잖아. 딸은 나보고 대학에서만 일하면 안 되냐고 계속 그래요. (웃음) 이웃 사람들도 이제 좀 눈빛이 달라졌지. 내보고 어떻게 그렇게 일 하냐고 계속 물어보고.

그래도, 그건 아니고. 중국에 있었으면 더 발전했을 텐데. 제 또래는 다 교수, 부장, 차장인데 저는 이제 밑바닥이잖아요. 그건 좀 속상해요. 교수.. 부교수 정도는 다 됐어요. 교수도 많고 회사간 애들은 다 직책은 높게 있고. 내 혼자 아무것도 없고, 그거 생각하면 슬프고 그래요. 제가 지금 3 년 전 생각하면 일하는 자체가 자랑스럽고 그런데...

References

Agee, J. (2004). Negotiating a teaching identity: An African American teacher's struggle to teach in test-driven contexts. *Teachers College Record, 106(4),* 747–774.

Ajayi, L. (2011). How ESL teachers' sociocultural identities mediate their teacher role identities in a diverse urban school setting. *Urban Review, 43,* 654-680.

Akkerman, S. F. & Meijer, P. C. (2011). A dialogical approach to conceptualizing teacher identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 27, 308-319.

Alexander, P.A., Schallert, D. L., & Reynolds, R. A. (2009): What is learning anyway? A topographical perspective considered. *Educational Psychologist, 44(3),* 176-192.

Apple, M. W. (1977). The process and ideology of valuing in educational settings. In A. A. Bellack & H. M. Kliebard (Eds.), *Curriculum and evaluation* (pp. 468-493). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Apple, M. W. (1995). *Education and power (2nd ed.).* New York, NY: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (2008). Curriculum planning: Content, form, and the politics of accountability. In F. M. Connelly (Ed.), *The sage handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 25-44). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publication.

Au, K. H. & Blake, K. M. (2003). Cultural identity and learning to teach in a diverse community: Findings from a collective case study. *Journal of Teacher Education, 54(3),* 192-205.

Auh, S-Y., & Jung, J-H. (2011). The curriculum development and effectiveness tests of the cultural diversity in Families Course in the National Teachers' Educational College. *The Journal of the Research Institute of Korean Education, 29(1),* 61-82.

Aveling, N. (2004). Being the descendant of colonialists: white identity in context, *Race Ethnicity and Education, 7(1),* 57-71.

Bae, S-J. (2013). Nationalism and Racism: How Nationalism Works? *Critical Review of History, 104*, 348-386.

Bae, S-S. (2012). Childern's self-identity in multicultural education: Seeking solution from the subject of moral education. *Journal of Korean Philosophical Society, 122*, 161-189.

Ball, D.L. & Cohen, D.K. (1999). Developing practice, developing practitioners: toward a practice-based theory of professional education. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practices* (pp. 3-32). San Fransciso, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Ballenger, C. (1998). *Teaching other people's children literacy and learning in a bilingual classroom*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Bang, G-H. (2012) The development and organization of multicultural curriculum in public alternative middle school. *Multicultural Education Studies, 5(1),* 93-115.

Banks, J. A. (1981). *Education in the 80s: Multiethnic education*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Banks, J. A. (2001). Multicultural education: Characteristics and goals. In J.A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: issues and perspectives (4th ed., pp. 3-30).* New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Banks, J. A. (2002). *An introduction to multicultural education (3rd ed.).* Toronto, Canada: Allyn and Bacon.

Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational Researcher, 37*, 129-139.

Banks, J. A. (2009). Multicultural education: Dimensions and paradigms. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *The routledge international companion to multicultural education* (pp. 9-32). New York, NY: Routledge.

Banks, J., Cochran-Smith, M., Moll, L., Richert, A., Zeichner, K., LePage, P., Darling-Hammond, L., & Duffy, H. with McDonald, M. (2005). Teaching diverse learners. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 232-274). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bartlett, L. (2007). To seem and to feel: Situated identities and literacy practices. *Teachers College Record, 109(1),* 51–69.

Bartolome, L. I. (1994). Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review, 64(2),* 173-194.

Baxter, L. A. (2004). Relationships as dialogues. *Personal Relationships, 11*, 1–22.

Beauchamp, C., & Thomas, L. (2011). New teachers' identity shifts at the boundary of teacher education and initial practice. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 50, 6-13.

Bourdieu P. (2000). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In R. Arum & I. R. Beattie (Eds.), *The structure of schooling: Reading in the sociology of education* (pp. 56-69). Mountain view, CA: Mayfield publishing company.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York, NY: Greenwood.

Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the constructions of economic life*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Bransford, J., Derry, S., Berliner, D., Hammerness, K., & Beckett, K. L. (2005).Theories of learning and their roles in teaching. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 40-87). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brodkey, L. (1987). Writing critical ethnographic narratives. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 18(2),* 67-76.

Brown, A. & Brown, K. (2010). Strange fruit indeed: interrogating contemporary textbook representations of racial violence toward African Americans. *Teachers College Record, 112(1),* 31–67.

Brown, K. D. & Brown, A. L. (2012). Useful and dangerous discourse: Deconstructing racialized knowledge about African-American students. *Educational Foundations, 26,* 11-26.

Brown, K. D. & Kraehe, A. M. (2010). The complexities of teaching the complex: examining how future educators construct understandings of sociocultural knowledge and schooling. *Educational Studies, 46,* 91-115.

Brown, K. D. (2010). Is this what we want them to say? Examining the tensions in what U.S. preservice teachers say about risk and academic achievement. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26,* 1077-1087.

Brown, K. D. (2013). Trouble on my mind: Toward a framework of humanizing critical sociocultural knowledge for teaching and teacher education. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 16(3),* 316-338.

De Lissovoy, N. & Brown, A. L. (2013). Antiracist solidarity in critical education: Contemporary problems and possibilities. *Urban Review, 45,* 539-560.

De Lissovoy, N. (2012a). Education and violation: conceptualizing power, domination, and agency in the hidden curriculum. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 15(4),* 463-484. 2011

De Lissovoy, N. (2012b). Conceptualizing the carceral turn: Neoliberalism, racism, and violation. *Critical Sociology, 39(5),* 739–755.

Bu, H-S. & Kim, J-H. (2010). Understanding multicultural children of Korea with the lifelong perspective as investigating on the historical development of American multicultural identity theories. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Adult & Continuing Education, 13(4),* 59-89.

Burstein, N. D. & Cabello, B. (1989). Preparing teachers to work with culturally diverse students: A teacher education model. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40(5).* 9-16.

Cameron, L. & Low, G. (Eds.). (1999). *Researching and applying metaphor*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Carter, K. & Doyle, W. (1996). Personal narrative and life history in learning to teach. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education (2nd ed.).*(pp. 120-142). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster MaCmillan.

Casmir, F. L. (1984). Perception, cognition, and intercultural communication. *Communication, 13(1),* 1–16.

Castro, A. J. (2010). Themes in the research on preservice teachers' views of cultural diversity since 1985: Implications for researching millennial preservice teachers. *Educational Researcher, 39(3),* 198-210.

Chang, I-S. & Jeon, K-J. (2013). Case Study of Elementary Teachers' Perception and Practices for Multicultural Education. *Multicultural Education Studies. 6(1),* 73-103.

Chang, O-J. (2011). A Study on the Performance Reality of Multi-cultural Education System in the Elementary School. *Journal of Korean Association of Practical Arts education, 24(1),* 281-304.

Cheong, Y-S. (2011). Times of diversity, diverse education. *Journal of Social-science Study, 19(2),* 234-301.

Chilisa, B. (2012). *Indigenous research methodologies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cho, H-N. & Park, E-H. (2013). Analysis on social implication of mixed-blood based on the review of newspaper articles from 1950 to 2011. *Journal of Multi-Cultural Contents Studies, 14,* 367-407.

Choi, J-H. (2011). *A qualitative study in the school maladjustment of North Korean adolescent refugee*. (Master thesis). Retrieved from RISS (Research Information Sharing Service). (Accession Order No. T12531178)

Choi, J-H. (2013). A study of the implication of the moment lesson through reviewing the theories of post-structuralism. *Theory and Research in Citizenship Education, 45(4),* 263-298.

Choi, Y-K. & Jeon, H-J. (2011). Pre-service early childhood teachers' perceptions on and needs for multicultural education. *Journal of Children's Literature & Education, 12(1),* 241-259.

Clarke, M. (2008). *Language teacher identities: Co-constructing discourse and community*. Ontario, Canada: Multilingual Matters.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Davis, D., & Fries, K. (2004). Multicultural teacher education. In J. Banks (Ed.). *Handbook of research on multicultural education, (2nd ed.).* (pp. 931-975). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. L. (1992). Interrogating cultural diversity: inquiry and action. *Journal of Teacher Education, 43(2).* 104-115.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2010). Toward a theory of teacher education for social justice. In A. Hargreaves, A. Liberman, M. Fullan, & D. Hopkins (Eds.), *Second International handbook of educational change* (pp. 445-468). London, NY: Springer.

Cochran-Smith, M., Barnatt, J., Lahann, R., Shakman, K., & Terrell, D. (2008). Teacher education for social justice: Critiquing the critiques. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice in education* (pp. 625-639). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cochran-Smith, M., Shakman, K., Jong, C., Terrell, D. G., Barnatt, J., & McQuillan, P. (2009). Good and just teaching: The case for social justice in teacher education. *American Journal of Education, 115(3),* 347-377.

Cokrell, K. S., Placier, P. L., Cockrell, D. H., & Middleton, J. N. (1999). Coming to terms with "diversity" and "multiculturalism" in teacher education: Learning about our students, changing our practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 15*, 351-366.

Collier, M. J. & Thomas, M (1988). Cultural identity. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication* (pp. 99-120). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher, 19(5),* 2-14.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1999). *Shaping a professional identity: Stories of education practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Costigan, A. T. (2013). New urban teachers transcending neoliberal educational reforms: Embracing aesthetic education as a curriculum of political action. *Urban Education, 48(1)*, 116-148.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (2nd ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crotty, M. (1999). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process.* London: Sage.

Daegu Metropolitan Office of Education (2012a). *General status*. Retrieved April. 16, 2013, from http://www.dge.go.kr/contentsHtml.do?contentsVal=411&menu_seq=411

Daegu Metropolitan Office of Education (2012b). *Present condition of students from multicultural families*. Retrieved April. 16, 2013, from http://www.dge.go.kr

Daegu Office of Education. (2014). *2014 direction of Daegu education and major projects plan*. Daegu, South Korea:

Darling-Hammond, L. (2004). What happens to a dream deferred?: Continuing quest for equal educational opportunity. In J. Banks (Ed.). *Handbook of research on multicultural education, (2nd ed.).* (pp. 607-630). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., Banks, J., Zumwalt, K., Gomez, L., Sherin, M. G., Griesdorn, J., and Finn, L. (2005). Educational goals and purposes: Developing a curricular vision for teaching. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 169-200). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., Hammerness, K., Grossman, P., Rust, F., & Shulman, L. (2005). The design of teacher education programs. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 390-441). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

De Lissovoy, N. & Brown, A. L. (2013). Antiracist solidarity in critical education: Contemporary problems and possibilities. *Urban Review, 45*, 539-560.

De Lissovoy, N. (2011). Pedagogy in common: Democratic education in the global era. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 43(10),* 1119-134.

De Lissovoy, N. (2012a). Education and violation: conceptualizing power, domination, and agency in the hidden curriculum. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 15(4),* 463-484.

De Lissovoy, N. (2012b). Conceptualizing the carceral turn: Neoliberalism, racism, and violation. *Critical Sociology, 39(5),* 739–755.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1993). Researching change and changing the researcher. *Harvard Educational Review, 63(4),* 389-411.

deMarrais, K. & Tisdale, K. (2002). What happens when researchers inquire into difficult emotions?: Reflections on studying women's anger through qualitative interviews. *Educational Psychologist, 37(2),* 115–123.

Dixson, A. D. & Dingus, J. E. (2008). In search of our mothers' gardens: Black women teachers and professional socialization. *Teachers College Record, 110(4),* 805-837.

Do, S-L., & Schallert, D. L. (2004). Emotions and classroom talk: Toward a model of the role of affect in students' experiences of classroom discussions. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 96(4),* 619–634

Dole, C. & Csordas, T. (2003). Trials of Navajo youth: Identity, healing, and the straggle for maturity. *Ethos, 31(3),* 357-384.

Donaldson, K. B. (1997). Antiracist education and a few courageous teachers, *Equity & Excellence in Education, 30(2),* 31-38

Eisner, E. W. (2002). *The educational imagination: On design and evaluation of school programs (3rd ed.).* New York, NY: Macmillan

El-Haj. T. R. A. (2003). Practicing for equity from the standpoint of the particular: exploring the work of one urban teacher network. *Teachers College Record, 105(5).* 817-845.

Elvira, L. (2010). The development of national identity through Korean language learning. *Multicultural Education Studies, 3(1),* 105-124.

Enyedy. N., Goldberg, J. and Welsh, K. M. (2005). Complex dilemmas of identity and practice. *Wiley InterScience,* 15, 68-93.

Eum, H. (1999). Minjok as a modern and democratic construct: Shin Chaeho's historiography of Korea. In G. Shin & M. Robinson (Eds.), *Colonial modernity in Korea* (pp.336-361). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center.

Fanon, F. (2008). *Black Skin, White Masks,* (P. Richard, Trans.). New York: Grove.

Ferguson, A. (2001). *Bad boys: Public schools in the making of black masculinity*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Ferguson, A. A. (2002). *Naughty by nature*. In Jossey Bass Reader on gender in education (pp. 584-608). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Field, S. L., Bauml, M., Wilhelm, R. W., & Jenkins, J. (2012). Folk dress, fiestas, and festivals: How is Mexico portrayed in U.S. primary grade social studies textbook? *The Journal of Social Studies Research, 36(1),* 22-46.

Fischman, E. & McLaren, P. (2000). Schooling for democracy: Toward a critical utopianism. *Contemporary Sociology, 29 (1),* 168-179.

Flores, M. A., & Day, C. (1996). Contexts which shape and reshape new teachers′ identities: A multi-perspective study. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*, 219–232.

Flores, M. T. (2007). Navigating contradictory communities of practice in learning to teach for social justice. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 38(4),* 380–402.

Fontana, A. & Frey, J. H. (2008). The interview: from structured questions to negotiated text. In N. K. Denin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (pp. 645-672). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Freire, P. (1983). *Pedagogy of the oppressed,* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York, NY: Continuum. (Original work published 1968)

Freire, P. (2009). *Teachers as cultural workers: Listens to those who dare teach with new commentary*. Boulder, Co: Westview Press.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. New York: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2000). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education, 25,* 99-125.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Geiger, S. (1986). Women's life histories: method and content. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 11(2).* 334-351.

Gillborn, D. & Youdell, D. (2009). Critical perspectives on race and schooling. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *The routledge international companion to multicultural education* (pp. 173-185). New York, NY: Routledge.

Giroux, H. A. (1992). *Border Crossings: cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Giroux, H. A. (2000). Insurgent multiculturalism and the promise of pedagogy. In E. M. Duarte, & S. Smith (Eds.), *Foundational perspectives in multicultural education* (pp. 195-212). New York: Longman.

Giroux, H. A. (2007). Democracy, education and the politics of critical pedagogy. In P. MaLaren & J. L. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* (pp. 1-8). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Giroux, H. A. (2010). Neoliberalism, pedagogy, and cultural politics: Beyond the theatre of cruelty. In Z. Leonardo (Ed.), *Handbook of cultural politics and education* (pp. 49-70). Boston: Sense Publishers.

Glazier, J. A. (2005). Talking and teaching through a positional lens: Recognizing what and who we privilege in our practice. *Teaching Education, 16(3),* 231–243.

Glazier. J. A. (2003). Moving closer to speaking the unspeakable: white teachers talking about race. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 30(1*). 73-94.

Glesne, C. (2011). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction (4th ed.).* Boston: Pearson.

Gomez, M., Black, R. W., & Allen, A. (2007). "Becoming" a teacher. *Teachers College Record, 109(9),* 2107-2135.

González, N. (2005). Beyond culture: The hybridity of funds of knowledge. In N. Gonzales, L. C. Moll, & C. Amanti (Eds.), *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Goodall, H. L. (2008). *Writing qualitative inquiry: self, stories, and academic life*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Goodley, D. (1996). Tales of hidden lives: a critical examination of life history research with people who have learning difficulties. *Disability & Society, 11(3),* 333-348.

Goodson, I. F. & Sikes, P. (2001). *Life history research in educational settings: Learning from lives*. Buckingham, PA: Open University.

Grant C. A. & Sachs (2000). Multicultural education and postmodernism: Movement toward a dialogue. In E. M. Duarte & S. Smith (Eds.), *Foundational perspectives in multicultural education* (pp. 178-194). New York, NY: Longman.

Grant, C. A. & Sleeter, C. E. (2007). *Turning on learning: Five approaches for multicultural teaching plans for race, class, gender, and disability (4th ed).* New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons

Grant, C. A. (2008). An essay on searching for curriculum and pedagogy for African American students. *American Behavioral Scientist, 51(7),* 885-906.

Grant, C. A. (2012). Cultivating flourishing lives: A robust social justice vision of education. *American Educational Research Journal, 49(5),* 910-934.

Grant, C. A., Elsbree, A. R., & Fondrie, S. (2004). A decade of research on the changing terrain of multicultural education research. In J. Banks (Ed.). *Handbook of research on multicultural education, (2nd ed.).* (pp. 184-207). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ha, H-S. (2011). The counseling strategies based on analysis of teacher's bias toward multicultural students. *The Korean Journal of Counseling, 12(6),* 2065-2083.

Ha, S-B. (2012). Yellow Skin, White Masks: A Historical Consideration of Internalized Racism and Multiculturalism in South Korea. *The Research of Human Science, 33,* 525-556.

Hamachek, D. (1999). Effective teachers: what they do, how they do it, and the importance of self-knowledge. In R. P. Lipka & T. M. Brinthaupt (Eds.), *The role of self in teacher development* (pp. 189-224). Albany, N.Y: State University of New York Press.

Han, G-S. (2007). Critical Multiculturalism. In Unesco Asia (Eds.), *Understanding of multicultural society* (pp. 135-165). Seoul, South Korea: Dong-Noyk.

Han, H-R., Park, J-Y., & Jang, E-J. (2010). Case study of elementary teachers' perception and practices for multicultural education. *Journal of Korean Practical Arts Education, 16(4),* 169-196.

Han, K-G. & Han, K-S. (2007). The ideal and the real of multicultural society in South Korea. In Korean Society Study (Ed**.)**, *Korean society's transformation and integration in Northeast Asian Multicultural age* **(**pp. 71-116). Seoul: South Korea.

Han, S-M. (2003). Survey on elementary school male teachers' identity and their perspective on female teachers. *Pusan Education Studies, 16(1),* 169-188.

Hawley, W.D. & Valli, L. (2008). The essentials of effective professional development: a new consensus. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practices* (pp. 127-150). San Fransciso: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hay, I. (2005). *Qualitative research methods in human geography (2nd ed.).* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Helms, J. E. (1990). *Black and white racial identity: Theory, research, and practice.* New York, NY: Greenwood press.

Holland, D. & Lave, J. (2001), History in person: an introduction. In D. Holland & J. Lave (Eds.), *History in Person: Enduring struggles, contentious practice, intimate identities* (pp. 3-33). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Holland, D. C. & Lachicotte, W. Jr. (2007). Vygotsky, Mead and the New Sociocultural Studies of Identity Formation. In H. Daniels, M. Cole, & J. V. Wertsch (Eds.),

Vygotsky: The Cambridge Companion to Vygotsky. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holland, D., Lachicotte Jr., W., Skinner, D., & Cain, Carole (1998).*Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. London, England: Harvard University Press.

Holquist, M. (1990). *Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World*. New York: Routledge.

Howard, G. R. (1999).*We can't teach what we don't know: White teachers, multiracial schools.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Howard, T. C. & Aleman, G. R. (2008). Teacher capacity for diverse learners: What do teachers need to know? In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser& D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts (3rd ed.).* (pp. 157-174). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group/Association of Teacher Educators.

Hu, D-H (2010, June). The historical formation process of homogeneous myth. Presented at *The 3rd Policy Forum of Korean Parliamentary League on Children, Population and Environmen*t. Seoul, South Korea.

Hur, C-S., Chang, I-S., Park, C-H. (2010). A proposal for curriculum of multicultural education through analyzing in-service teacher education program. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies, 28(4),* 77-101.

Hwang, K-M. (2004). *Beyond birth: social status in the emergence of modern Korea*. Harvard University Press, 2004

Hwang, M-H., Ko, H-W., & Kim, J-Y. (2010). Experiences of elementary school teachers with ethnic minorities' children. Asia Pacific Education Review, 1*1(1),* 147-167.

Hynds, A., Sleeter, C., Hindle, R., Savage, C., Penetito, W., & Meyer. L. H. (2011). TeKotahitanga: A case study of a repositioning approach to teacher professional development for culturally responsive pedagogies. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 39(4),* 339-351.

Hyun, K-J. (2012). Bicultural identity and marital well-being among marriage immigrant women: Self-positivity derived from taking multiple perspectives as a mediator. *Korean Journal of Social Welfare, 64(2),* 241-271.

Jackson, P. W. (1992). Conception of curriculum and curriculum specialists. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 3-40). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Jang, I. & Jeon, K-J. (2013). Case study of elementary teachers' perception and practices for multicultural education. *Multicultural Education Studies, 6(1),* 73-103.

Jang, W-S. (2009). A study on the curriculum for multi-cultural teacher education suitable to Korean society. *Social Studies Education, 48(1),* 57~79.

Jang, Y-Y. & Jeong, K-S. (2012). A study on the curriculum for multi-cultural teacher education suitable to Korean society. *The Journal of Elementary Education Studies, 19(1),* 91-110.

Jeon, K-W. (2010, October 26). South Korea likes "multicultural policies" which others already threw away. *New Daily*. Retrieved from http://www.newdaily.co.kr/news/article.html?no=59751

Jeong, H-J. & Nam, S-J. (2012). The study of elementary social studies teacher identity formation process. *Social Studies Education Studies, 19(4),* 143-158.

Jeong, H-S. (2011). Identity dilemma in primary school student teacher: With special regard to the practice teaching course for Korean language education. *Study of Korean Language Education in Korean elementary, 45,* 303-333.

Jeong, J-H, (2014). Development of Small-Group Multicultural Early Childhood Teacher Education Program with Media Literacy Approach. *Study of Children`s Literature & Education, 15(2),* 309-337.

Jeong, J-H. (2009). A qualitative analysis of early childhood teacher's frame of reference for facilitating the transformational level of multicultural teacher education. *Open Early Childhood Education Studies, 14(6),* 225-252.

Jeong, K-S.& Lee, S-M. (2012). Korean national identity from a comparative perspective. *Comparative Korean Studies, 19(1),* 45-72.

Jeong, S-M. (2010). A study on the education of national identity in multi-cultural age: Focused on the revision of moral education curriculum in 2007. *Ethics Studies, 75*, 131-152.

Jersild, A. T. (1955). When teachers face themselves. New York, NY: Teachers college, Columbia University.

Jo, A-M. (2012). Identity confusion and coping of multicultural youth, *Adolescent Behavior Studies, 17,* 1-13.

Jo, H. (2009). A study of teachers' perception of the children of migrants: A case study of an elementary school in Seoul. *Anthropology of Education, 12(1),* 263-295.

Johnson-Bailey, J. (2004). Enjoining positionality and power in narrative work: balancing contentious and modulating forces. In K. DeMarais & S. D. Lapan (Eds.), *Foundations for research, methods for inquiry in education and the social sciences* (pp.128-138). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Jung, B-W. (2003). Japanese remainder after Korean independence. *History Criticism, 64*, 129-149.

Jung, T-J. (2008). A Study of the Anti-prejudice education method for students from the multicultural family in Korea. *Journal of Moral Ethic Education, 27*, 167-192.

Kailin, J. (1999). How White teachers perceive the problem of racism in their schools: A case study in “liberal” Lakeview. *Teachers College Record, 100(4)*, 724-750

Kang, J-G. (1992). A Study about the defecting motivation of North Korean refugees and classification. In Korean Sociological Association (Ed.), *Korean War and social change* (pp. 93-134). Seoul, South Korea: Poolbit.

Kang, J-G. (2012). A Study on the Anti-Multicultural Discourse of Korean Society: With a focus on the Internet domain. *The Research of Human Science, 32*, 5-34.

Kang, T-K. (2011). Racism reflected in U.S. imperialism in the end of the 19th century. *Kyeong-Ju History Study, 34*, 165-184.

Kegan, R. (1980). Making meaning: the constructive-developmental approach to persons and practice. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 58(5),* 373-380.

Kidron, C. A. (2004). Surviving a distant past: A case study of the cultural construction of trauma descendant identity. *Ethos, 31(4),* 513-544.

Kim, H-D. (2010). Construction of Educational Contents in Multicultural Education and Tasks for Their Implementation. *Korean Journal of Comparative Education, 20(5),* 109-134.

Kim, H-M. (2014, August). The expansion of racism and absence of nation. Paper presented at *2014 Meeting of Reporting Present Racism in South Korean Society*, Seoul, South Korea (pp. 8-12). Seoul, South Korea.

Kim, J-S. (2011). The Critical Study of ′Korean style′ Multiculturalism as Welfare Policy Excluding Citizenship. *Economic & Social Studies, 92*, 205-246

Kim, M-H. (2010). Critical review on the research trends and tasks of multicultural education in Korea. *Journal of Learner-Centered Curriculum and Instruction, 10(1),* 61-86.

Kim, M-H. (2011). The structuralization of equity pedagogy method based on the levels of citizenship. *Study of Global Education, 3(1),* 69-93.

Kim, S-A (2011). Preparing art teachers for multicultural education: The implication for teacher education. *Journal of Research in Art Education, 12(1),* 27-50.

Kim, S-H. (2011). Qualitative study on children's identity from multicultural families. *Family & Culture, 23(2),* 25-61.

Kim, S-J. & Kim, B-J. (2011). Comparative research about new identity of Korean-Americans. *Journal of Korean political and diplomatic history. 33(1),* 197-233.

Kim, S-Y. (2013). Critical analysis on multicultural curriculum and its implementation: Focus on the theme of 'diverse families' from a case of South Korea. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies, 31(4),* 111~140.

Kim, T-H. (2012). Reproduction of class and academic level in South Korean society. *Study of Korean Sociology, 12*, 907-925.

Kim, T-S. (2010). Contents development and teachers' training for multicultural education. *Journal of the International Network for Korean Language and Culture, 7(1),* 81-116.

Kim, Y. Y. (2007). Ideology, identity, and intercultural communication: An analysis of differing academic conceptions of cultural identity. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 36(3)*, 237-253.

Kim, Y-C. (2011). *The most black eyes*. Seoul, South Korea: Academypress.

Kim, Y-M. (2013). Critical Review on multicultural discourses in South Korea. *South Korean Politics Diplomacy History, 35(1)*, 141-174.

Kincheloe, J. L. & Steinberg, S. R. (1997). *Changing multiculturalism*. Buchingham, PA: Open University Press.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2004). The knowledges of teacher education: Developing a critical complex epistemology. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, Winter, 49-66.

King, J. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity and the miseducation of teachers. *Journal of Negro Education, 60(2),* 133-146.

Korea Broadcast Advertising Corp. (2001). All of these are skin colors. Retrieved on October 6, 2014 from

https://www.kobaco.co.kr/businessintro/about/print_ad_list_view.asp?printInfoNo=63&page=1&Year=2001&select_flag=&Key=&Subject=0&Matter=0

Kramp, M. K. (2004). Exploring life and experience through narrative inquiry. In K. deMarris, & S.D. Lapan (Eds.), *Foundations for research: Methods of inquiry in education and the social sciences*, Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kumashiro, K. (2000). Toward a theory of anti-oppressive education. *Review of Educational Research, 70(1),* 25-53.

Kwon, S-J. (2010). Exploring teachers′ stereotypes on students from multicultural families. *Journal of Education for International Understanding, 5(2),* 5-37.

Kyun, J-Y., Ha, E-S., & Chung, K-S. (2012). Teachers′ perceptions and practices in the early childhood classroom: The implementation of multicultural education. *Journal of Child Studies, 33(3),* 177-197.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32(3),* 465-491.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2004). New directions in multicultural education: Complexities, boundaries, and critical race theory. In J. Banks (Ed.). *Handbook of research on multicultural education, (2nd ed.).* (pp. 50-65). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge.

Lazar, A. M. (2004). *Learning to be literacy teachers in urban schools: Stories of growth and change*. International Reading Association.

Lea, V. (2010). Empowering preservice teachers, students, and families through critical multiculturalism. In S. May (Ed.), *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and antiracist education* (pp. 33-45). Philadelphia, PA.: Falmer Press.

Lee, B-J. (2014, September 2). “Arrest us as well” 53 teachers cried. *The Kyunghyang Shinmum*. Retrieved from http://news.khan.co.kr/kh_news/khan_art_view.html?artid=201409022141305&code=940202

Lee, B-J., Park, J-Y., & Park, E-H. (2010). A study on developing a teacher training program for multicultural education: Focused on Gyeongsangnam-do. *Education and Culture Studies, 16(1),* 225-254.

Lee, D-E. (2008). Multiplicity of Korean language teachers’ identities. *Educational Policy Forum, 117*, 13-16.

Lee, D-S., Kim, Y-C., & Hwang, C-H. (2012). Life and education of children of multicultural families: Reconstructing life historic voices. *Multicultural Education Studies, 5(1),* 137-154.

Lee, H-S. & Song, H-S. (2011). Development research in the elementary school Fine Arts curriculum for multicultural education. *Journal of Korea Elementary Art Education, 29*, 155-180.

Lee, I-J. (2014). A study on methods of the multicultural human rights education in elementary school. *Ethics Studies, 94*, 217-248.

Lee, J-B. (2008). *A study of actual state of education for multicultural children*. Seoul, South Korea: Korea Education Development Institute.

Lee, J-B. (2012). Ethnic nationalism and multiculturalism in Korea. *Multicultural Education Studies, 5(1),* 199-215.

Lee, J-J. & Lee, J-K. (2011). A study on legal limitations of teachers’ right for expression. *Journal of Communication and Information Studies, 54*, 32-57.

Lee, J-M. (2008). *Multicultural education in South Korean public elementary schools: An analysis of teachers’ experiences and perspectives and school curriculum*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations &Theses: Full Text database. (Publication No. 3418565).

Lee, K-E. & Kim, J-W. (2012). Development and application of anti-bias education program using elementary integrated subjects. *Multicultural Education Studies, 5(2),* 53-71.

Lee, K-H. (2011). A study on preservice elementary teachers' perceptions about multicultural Korean education. *Study of Korean Language Education in Korean elementary, 44*, 33-73.

Lee, K-S. (2011). A study on multicultural attitude of social studies teacher in Gwangju-Jeonnam province. *Theory and Research in Citizenship Education, 43(1),* 87~109.

Lee, K-S. (2011). A study on multicultural attitude of social studies teacher in Gwangju Jeonnam Province. *Theory and Research in Citizenship Education, 43(1),* 87-109.

Lee, K-S., Lee, K-E., &Kim, J-S. (2013). A study on the development of Teacher support for children of multicultural families: Focusing on cultural diversity & multicultural efficacy. *Multicultural Education Studies, 6(1),* 1-19.

Lee, M-S. (1996). *A Study on the Yuejungchugsa movement, in the early 1880's: As the focus of the Exclusion movement of Chosun Chaekryak* (Master thesis). Retrieved from RISS (Research Information Sharing Service). (Accession Order No. T933960)

Lee, S-B., Seo, J-W., & Jeon, S-M. (2011). A study on the process of building sports instructor′s career identity in elementary school. *Journal of Korea Elementary Physical Education, 17(2),* 33-48.

Lee, S-M. & Song, J-Y. (2008). Early childhood teachers` beliefs in multicultural education. *Journal of Future Early Childhood Education, 15(30*), 185-214.

Lee, Y-C. (2007). The social institution of Confucianism: Centering on the institutions of family, nation and estate. *Acta Koreana, 34*, 271-319.

Lee, Y-K. (2005). A study on the development of teacher support for children of multicultural families: Focusing on cultural diversity and multicultural efficacy. *Parenting Support Studies, 1,* 89-102.

Lee, Y-S. (2012). *Leaving Choson: The last moment of Japanese facing defeat in 1945*. Seoul, South Korea: Critical Review of History.

Lien, H. N. (1999, April). A challenge toward binary racial epistemology: The reconstruction of cultural identity in multicultural teacher education. Presented at *the Annual Meeting of the AERA* (pp. 1-30). Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Lincoln, Y. S., Lynham, S. A., & Guba, E. G. (2011). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences, revisited. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln, *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 97-128). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Longstreet, W. S. & Shane, H. G. (1993). *Curriculum for a new millennium*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

MacGillivray, L., Ardell, A. L., Curwen, M. S., & Palma, J. (2004). Colonized Teachers: Examining the implementation of a scripted reading program. *Teaching Education, 15(2),* 131-144.

Madison, D. S. (2005). *Critical ethnography: Method, ethics, and performance (2nd ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mahan, J. M. & Rains, F. V. (1990). Inservice teachers expand their cultural knowledge and approaches through practica in American Indian communities. *Journal of American Indian Education, 29(2).* 11-24.

Mansbridge, J. (1999). Everyday talk in the deliberative system. In S. Macedo (ed.), *Deliberative Politics: Essays on Democracy and Disagreement* (pp. 211-220). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marsh, M. (2002). Examining the discourses that shape our teacher identities. *Curriculum Inquiry, 32(4),* 453-469.

Martin, R. J. &Van Gunten, D. M. (2002). Reflected identities: applying positionality and multicultural social reconstructionism in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53(1),* 44-54.

Marx, K. & Englels, F. (1999). *The communist manifesto*. Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Marx, S. (2006). *Revealing the invisible: Confronting passive racism in teacher education*. New York, London: Routledge.

May, S. & Sleeter, C. E. (2010). *Critical multiculturalism: Theory and praxis*. New York, NY: Routledge.

May, S. (1999). Critical multiculturalism and cultural difference. In S. May (Ed.), *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and antiracist education* (pp. 11-41). Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.

May, S. (2009). Critical multiculturalism and education. In J. A. Banks (Ed.). *The routledge international companion to multicultural education* (pp. 33-48). New York, NY: Routledge.

McCarthy, C. (1998). *The uses of culture: Education and the limits of ethnic affiliation*. New York: Routledge.

McDiarmid, G. W. (1992). What to do about differences? A study of multicultural education for teacher trainees in the Los Angeles United school district. *Journal of Teacher Education, 43(2),* 83-93.

McDonald, M. & Zeichner, K. M. (2008). Social justice teacher education. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice in education* (pp. 595-610). New York, NY: Routledge.

McLaren, P. & Torres, R. (1999). Racism and multicultural education: Rethinking 'race' and 'Whiteness' in late capitalism. In S. May (Ed.), *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and antiracist education* (pp. 42-76). Philadelphia, PA.: Falmer Press.

McLaren, P. (1998). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. New York, NY: Longman.

McLaren, P. (2000). White terror and oppositional agency: Towards a critical multiculturalism. In E. M. Duarte & S. Smith (Eds.). *Foundational perspectives in multicultural education* (pp. 213-242). New York, NY: Longman.

McVee. M. B. (2004). Narrative and the exploration of culture in teachers' discussions of literacy, identity, self, and other. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *20*, 881-899.

Mead, G. H. (1913). The Social Self. *Journal of Philosophy, 10,* 374-380.

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society: From the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Merriam, S. B., & Associates. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysi*s. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mertens, D. M. (2005). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods (2nd ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mignolo, W. (2005). *The idea of Latin America*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Mills, C. W. (1997). *The racial contract*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Milner IV, H. R. (2003). Reflection, racial competence, and critical pedagogy: How do we prepare preservice teachers to pose tough questions? *Race Ethnicity and Education, 6(2),* 193-208.

Milner IV, H. R. (2010). *Start where you are, but don't stay there*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Mitchell, A. (2008, December 10). Happier economy better than larger economy. *Korea Times*. Retrieved from http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/special/2009/09/265_35927.html

Mo, K-H. (2009). Policies and directions of multicultural teacher education in Korea. *The Journal of Korean Teacher Education, 26(4),* 245-270.

Mo, K-H., Choi, C-O., &Lim, H-K. (2010). A case study of a teacher training program for multicultural education. *Theory and Research in Citizenship Education, 42(4),* 31-53

Mo, K-W.& Hwang, H-W. (2007). A study on multicultural awareness of secondary school teachers: Focused on Korean and Social Studies teachers in the metropolitan area. *Theory and Research in Citizenship Education, 39(3),* 79-100.

Mohanty, S. P. (1993). The epistemic status of cultural identity: On "Beloved" and the postcolonial condition. *Cultural Critique, 24,* 41-80.

Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D. & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31(2),* 132-141.

Montecinos, C. (1995). Multicultural teacher education for a culturally diverse teaching force. In R. Martine (Ed.). *Practicing what we teach: Confronting diversity in teacher education* (pp. 97-115). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Moon, K. H. S. (1997). *Sex among allies: Military prostitution in U.S.-Korea relations.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Moon, K-S. & Lim, J. (2012). "I am a stranger in my own country!" The adjustment process of Korean returnee students to Korean school environment. *The Korean Journal of Educational Psychology, 26(3),* 621-649.

Moya, P. (2002). *Learning from experience: Minority identities, multicultural struggles.* Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press

Mueller. J. & O'Connor, C. (2007). Telling and retelling about self and ''others'': How pre-service teachers (re)interpret privilege and disadvantage in one college classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23,* 840–856.

Na, J-H. (2011). A review and synthesis of literature on multicultural teacher education curricula. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies, 29(2),* 173-197.

Nam, I-S. (2011). Contradictions of Korean Education based on Academic Success. *Social Theory, 40*, 101-127.

Ndura, E. (2004). Teachers ' discoveries of their cultural realms: Untangling the web of cultural identity. *Multicultural Perspectives, 6(3),* 10-16.

Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education (3rd ed.).* New York: Longman.

Nieto, S. (2003). *What keeps teachers going?* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Nieto, S. (2005). Public schools and the work of teachers. In S. Nieto (Ed.). *Why we teach* (pp. 3-11). New York, NY: Teacher College Press.

Nieto, S. (2009). Multicultural education in the United States: Historical realities and transformative possibilities. In J. A. Banks (Ed.). *The Routledge international companion to multicultural education* (pp. 79-95). New York, NY: Routledge.

Noel, J. (2001). Examining the connection between identity construction and the understanding of multicultural education. *Multicultural Perspectives, 3(2),* 3–7

Noguera, P. (2003). *City schools and the American dream: reclaiming the promise of public education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Norton, J. J. (1998). The Korean financial crisis, reform and positive transformation: Is a second ‘Han river miracle’ possible? *Global Economic Review: Perspectives on East Asian Economies and Industries, 27(2),* 3-36.

Ochs, E. & Capps, L. (2001). *Living narrative: Creating lives in everyday storytelling*. London: Harvard University Press.

Oh, K-S. (2007). *Multiculturalism in South Korea*. Seoul, South Korea: Hanul Academy.

Oh, S-B. (2009). An Exploratory study on the opportunities and challenges faced by children of immigrant workers within the Korean education system. *Studies on Korean Youth, 20(3),* 305~334.

Oh, S-B. (2010). An exploratory study on multi-cultural education policy: Its challenges and future direction. *Study of Educational Thoughts, 24(2),* 149-170.

Oh, S-J. (2005). Confirming teacher identity as Christian. *Faith & Education, 202,* 37-41.

Paccione, A. V. (2000). Developing a commitment to multicultural education. *Teachers College Record, 102(6),* 980-1005.

Palmer, P. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. New York: Jossey Bass.

Park, G-H. & Lee, C-H. (1997). Analysis of freshman's context at Incheon College of Education in 1992-1995. *College Life Studies, 10,* 63-88.

Park, G-Y., & Park, J-W. (2010). An Empirical Research on Consciousness of Chair "Understanding Multiculture" at the University. *Journal of Ethic Education Study, 22,* 273-300.

Park, H-Y. (2012). Multiculturalism and Multicultural Education from the Perspective of Critical Theory. *The Korean Journal of Philosophy of Education, 34(2),* 49~77

Park, I-S. (2001). Abolition of the cast's system in the latter Chosun dynasty and the respect of the right of equality in the Korean Constitution. *Yeungnam Law, 7,* 79-95.

Park, J-H. & Jeong, J-K. (2007). Acculturation and identity of immigrant wives of international marriages in Korea. *The Korean Journal of Woman Psychology, 12(4),* 395-432.

Park, J-Y., Jeon, H-J., Lee, S-O., & Kim, M-J. (2008, April). Analysis on cases of operating multicultural exemplary schools for curriculum development. Presented at *the International Conference of Korea Society for the Study of Elementary Education* (pp. 277-309). Seoul, South Korea.

Park, K-T. (2008). *Minority and Korean Society*. Seoul, South Korea: Humanitas.

Park, N-J. (2002). Formation of Korean modernity: how was racism established in this society. *Figures and Thoughts, 45,* 158-172.

Park, S. (2011). The cognition of primary and secondary school teachers on multicultural education in Daegu. *Social Studies Education Studies, 18(1),* 1-17.

Park, S-W. (2012). Writing journal as ontological inquiry: Pre-service teachers' identity formation. *Study of Anthropology of Education, 15(1),* 1-58.

Park, Y-K., Seong, K-H., & Jo, Y-D. (2008). Elementary and secondary school teachers` attitude towards cultural diversity and students from multicultural families. *Theory and Research in Citizenship Education, 40(3),* 1-28.

Park, Y-R. (2011, December 1). "Why they steal our job and pockets" from on-line to off-line… a counterattack from anti-multiculturalist. Kuki News. Retrieved from http://news.kukinews.com/article/print.asp?arcid=0005610075

Parkison P. (2008). Space for performing teacher identity: through the lens of Kafka and Hegel. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice,* 14(1), 51-60.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pebble Elementary School. (2013). *The plan for multicultural education through the Korean language curriculum*. Daegu, South Korea: Pebble Elementary School

Peshkin, A. (1988). In search of subjectivity: One's own. *Educational Researcher, 17(7),* 17-21.

Pewewardy, C. (2002). American Indian and White students talking about ethnic identity in teacher education programs: helping teacher education students know themselves as cultural beings. *Action in Teacher Education, 24(2).* 22-33.

Pollock, M. (Ed.). (2008). *Everyday antiracism: Getting real about race in school.* New York, NY: New Press.

Pollock, M., Deckman, S., Mira, M. & Shalaby, C. (2010). "But what can I do?" Three necessary tensions in teaching teachers about race. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61(3),* 211-224.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1997). The production of reason and power: Curriculum history and intellectual traditions. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 29(2),* 131-364.

Portelli, J. P. (1993). Exposing the hidden curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 25,* 343-358.

Pratt, K. L., & Rutt, R. (1999). *Korea: A historical and cultural dictionary*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Prawat, R.S. & Floden, R. E. (1994). Philosophical perspectives on constructivist views of learning. *Educational Psychology, 29(1),* 37-48.

Proweller, A. & Mitchener, C.P. (2004). Building teacher identity with urban youth: Voices of beginning middle school science teachers in an alternative certification program. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41(10),* 1044-1062.

Rex, L. A. & Nelson, M. C. (2004). How teachers' professional identities position high-stakes test preparation in their classrooms. *Teachers College Record, 106(6),* 1288-1331.

Richardson, V., & Placier, P. (2001). Teacher change. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching (4th ed*.) (pp. 905-947). Washington, D. C.: American Educational Research Association.

Ritchie, J. S. & Wilson, D. E. (2000). *Teacher narrative as critical inquiry: Rewriting the script*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Roberston, E. (2008). Teacher education in a democratic society: Learning and teaching the practices of democratic participation. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D. J. McIntyre, & K. E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts (3rd ed.)* (pp. 45-65). New York: Routledge.

Rodgers, C. R. & Scott, K. H. (2008). The development of personal self and professional identity in learning to teach. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D. J. McIntyre, & K. E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts (3rd ed.)* (pp. 732-755). New York: Routledge.

Rogers, R., Kramer, M. A., Mosley, M., Fuller, C., Light, R., Nehart, M., Jones, R., Beaman-Jones, S., DePasquale, J., Hobson, S., & Thomas, P. (2005). Professional development as social transformation: the literacy for social justice teacher research group. *Language Arts, 82(5),* 347-358.

Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Ryan, G. W. & Bernard, H. R. (2000). Data management and analysis methods. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln *(Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (2nd ed.)* (pp. 769–802). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2009). Promoting self-determined school engagement. In K. R. Wentzel & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Handbook of Motivation at School* (pp. 171-195). New York, NY: Routledge,

Sachs, J. (2005). Teacher education and the development of professional identity: Learning to be a teacher. In P. Denicolo & M. Kompf (Eds.), *Connecting policy and practice: Challenges for teaching and learning in schools and universities* (pp. 5–21). Oxford: Routledge.

Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Schmid, A. (2012). Korea between empires, 1895-1919. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Schubert, W. H. (1986). *Curriculum: Perspective, paradigm, and possibility*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Schwandt, T. A. (1997).*Qualitative inquiry: A dictionary of terms*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Scott, K. A. & Pinto, A. (2001). Revolutionizing multicultural education staff development: Factor structure of a teacher survey. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 34(1),* 32-42.

Seo, H. & Lee, S-E. (2009, May). A fundamental Study of multicultural education program for early childhood teachers. Presented at *the Spring Conference of Society of Korea Open Early Childhood Education Studies* (pp. 359-383*).* Seoul, South Korea.

Seol, D-H. (2006). Citizen, race, ethnics: Identity of children of marriage-migrant. *A Publication of Korean Sociological Association*, 79-99.

Seol, D-H. (2007). Sociology of the "Mixed-Blood": Hierarchical Nationhood of the Koreans. *The Journal of the Humanities, 52*, 125-160.

Seol, K-J. (2012). Analysis on the contents about multicultural changes in social studies textbooks: Focusing on sociology and anthropology chapters of the 2007 revised national Social Studies curriculum. *Multicultural Education Studies, 5(1),* 1-28.

Sfard, A. & Prusak, A. (2005). Telling identities: In search of an analytic tool for investigating learning as a culturally shaped activity. *Educational Researcher, 34(4),* 14-22.

Shechtman, Z. & Or. A. (1996). Applying counseling methods to challenge teacher beliefs with regard to classroom diversity and mainstreaming: An empirical study. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 12(2),* 137-147.

Shim, J-W. (2013). *A study on the operation and improvement of multicultural education programs: Focusing on the multicultural research model school in Korea*. (Master thesis). Retrieved from RISS (Research Information Sharing Service). (Accession Order No. T13244074)

Shin, G-W. (2006). *Ethnic nationalism in Korea: Genealogy, politics, and legacy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Shin, K-Y. (1999). The changes in class and status systems of Korean society. *Economy and Society, 44,* 30-58.

Shkedi, A. & Nisan, M. (2006). Teachers' cultural ideology: Patterns of curriculum and teaching culturally valued texts. *Teachers College Record, 108(4).* 687-725.

Sleeter, C. & Grant, C.A. (2003). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender (4th ed.).* New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Sleeter, C. E. & Bernal, D. D. (2004). Critical pedagogy, critical race theory, and antiracist education. In J. Banks (Ed.). *Handbook of research on multicultural education, (2nd ed.).* (pp. 240-258). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sleeter, C. E. (1992). *Keepers of the American Dream: a study of staff development and multicultural education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Sleeter, C. E. (2008). Preparing white teachers for diverse students. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts (3rd ed.).* (pp. 559-582). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group/Association of Teacher Educators.

Sleeter, C. E. (2012). Confronting the marginalization of culturally responsive pedagogy. *Urban Education, 47(3),* 562-584.

Song, I-J. (2009). Teachers' conception of history and the identity of history curriculum. *History Education Studies, 43,* 3-24.

Song, K-Y. & An, H-M. (2003).Survey of freshman's context at Seoul College of Education in 2002. *Students' Lives Studies, 28,* 175-207.

Sossin, L. (2005). Speaking Truth to Power? The Search for Bureaucratic Independence in Canada. *The University of Toronto Law Journal, 55(1),* 1-59.

Souto-Manning, M. (2014): Critical narrative analysis: the interplay of critical discourse and narrative analyses. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 27(2),* 159180.

Stanley, C. A. & Slattery, P. (2003). Who reveals what to whom?: Critical reflections on conducting qualitative inquiry as an interdisciplinary, biracial, male/female research team. *Qualitative Inquiry, 9(5),* 705-728.

Sussman, N. M. (2000). The dynamic nature of cultural identity throughout cultural transitions: Why home is not so sweet. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *4(4),* 355-373.

Tejada, C., Espinoza, M. & Gutierrez, K. (2003). Toward a decolonizing pedagogy: Social justice reconsidered. In P. P. Trifonas (Ed.), *Pedagogies of difference: Rethinking education for social change* (pp. 10-40). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

The Ministry of Education. (2006). *Educational support for children from multicultural backgrounds*. Retrieved January 23, 2013, from http://www.mest.go.kr/web/1121/ko/board/view.do?bbsId=159&boardSeq=8198

The Ministry of Education. (2007). *Elementary school and secondary school curricula*. Seoul, South Korea: The Ministry of Education.

The Ministry of Education. (2008). *Educational support for multicultural student*. Retrieved January 23, 2013, from http://www.mest.go.kr/web/1121/ko/board/view.do?bbsId=159&boardSeq=8198

The Ministry of Education. (2009). Elementary school and secondary school curricula. Seoul, South Korea: The Ministry of Education.

The Ministry of Education. (2010). Elementary school 3rd grade Music Textbook: 2007 curriculum. Seoul, South Korea: Mir-Rae-N.

The Ministry of Education. (2012a).*The plan for advancement of education for multicultural students*. Retrieved January 23, 2013, from http://www.mest.go.kr/

The Ministry of Education. (2012b). *Statistics Number of students from multicultural families*. Retrieved April. 19, 2013, from http://www.korea.kr/archive/expDocView.do?docId=11571

The Ministry of Education. (2013a). *Current state of multicultural students*. Retrieved October 8, 2014, from http://www.moe.go.kr/web/100068/ko/board/view.do?bbsId=343&boardSeq=51887

The Ministry of Education. (2013b). *Following the guideline for Timely Lesson*. Retrieved October 8, 2014, from http://www.moe.go.kr/web/45859/ko/board/view.do?bbsId=294&boardSeq=51224

The Ministry of Education. (2014a). *The explanation of the document about the restriction on Yellow Ribbon*. Retrieved October 8, 2014, from http://www.moe.go.kr/web/45861/ko/board/view.do?bbsId=295&boardSeq=56767

The Ministry of Education. (2014b). *The plan for support for North Korean refugee students*. Retrieved October 8, 2014, from http://www.moe.go.kr/web/106888/ko/board/view.do?bbsId=339&boardSeq=52919

The Ministry of Gender Equality and Family. (2008). *Support for multicultural families act*. Retrieved October 8, 2014, from http://www.law.go.kr/LSW/jsp/

The Ministry of Security and Public Administration (2011). *Statistics of foreigner numbers in local government in 2011*. Retrieved April. 16, 2013, from http://www.liveinkorea.kr/board/new_board_read.asp?pzt=mb&lng=kr&id=1649&num=2046348&pg=3&gr

The Ministry of Unification. (2013). *Operating "A Unification Education Week."* Retrieved October 8, 2014, from http://www.unikorea.go.kr/content.do?cmsid=1557&mode=view&cid=14648

The National Statistical Office (2013). *Demographic statistics*. Retrieved April19, 2013, from http://kostat.go.kr/portal/korea/index.action

Tisdell, E. J. (2006). Spirituality, cultural identity, and epistemology in culturally responsive teaching in higher education. *Multicultural Perspectives, 8(3),* 19-25.

Torok, C. E. & Agullar, T. E. (2000). Changes in preservice teachers' knowledge and beliefs about language issues. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 33(2),* 24-31.

Trent, J. & Lim, J. (2010). Teacher identity construction in school-university partnerships: Discourse and practice. Teaching and Teacher Education, 26, 1609-1618.

Tsui, A. (2011). Complexities of identity formation: A narrative inquiry of an EFL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly, 41(4),* 657-680.

Tytler, R., Symington, D., Malcom, C., & Kirkwood, V. (2011). Discourse communities: A framework from which to consider professional development for rural teachers of science and mathematics. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27,* 871-879

Um, S-J. & Won, J-L. (2012).Current research trends and directions for future research in multicultural teacher education. *The Korean Journal of Early Childhood Special Education, 12(4),* 51-80.

United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (UNESCO UN CERD) (2007). *Press Release: Committee on the elimination of racial discrimination considers Report of Republic of Korea.* Geneva, 10, August, 2007.

Urrieta, L. Jr. (2007). Identity production in figured worlds: how some Mexican Americans become Chicana/o activist educators. *The Urban Review, 39(2),* 117-144.

Valencia, R. R. (1997). Genetic pathology model of deficit thinking. In R. R. Valencia (Ed.), *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice* (pp. 41-112). Oxford, UK: RoutledgeFalmer

Vallance, E. (1973). Hiding the hidden curriculum: An interpretation of the language of justification in nineteenth-century educational reform. *Curriculum Theory Network, 4,* 5-21.

van Dijk, T. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society, 4(2),* 249–283.

Van Galen, J. A. (2010). Class, identity, and teacher education. *Urban Review, 42*. 253-270.

Vavrus. M. (2009). Sexuality, schooling, and teacher identity formation: A critical pedagogy for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*, 383-390.

Villegas, A. M. & Davis, D. E. (2008). Preparing teachers of color to confront racial/ethnic disparities in educational outcomes. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts (3rd ed.).* (pp. 583-605). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group/Association of Teacher Educators.

Villenas, S. (1996). The colonizer/colonized Chicana ethnographer: Identity, marginalization, and co-optation in the field. *Harvard Educational Review, 66(4),* 711-731.

Walker, V. S. (2001). African American teaching in the south: 1940-1960. *American Educational Research Journal, 38(4),* 751-779.

Watson, C. (2006). Narratives of practice and the construction of identity in teaching. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 12(5),* 509-526.

Watson, I. (2010). Multiculturalism in South Korea: A Critical Assessment. *Journal of Contemporary Asia, 40(2),* 337-346.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Wigfield, A., Tonks, S., & Klauda, S. L. (2009). Expectancy-value theory. In K. R. Wentzel & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Handbook of Motivation at School* (pp. 55-75). New York, NY: Routledge,

Woo, H-S. (2010). A case study of preservice teachers' experiences in a multicultural mentoring program. *The Journal of Korean Teacher Education, 27(4),* 141-165.

Yang, K-M & Cheong, J-K. (2008). *A study of ways to vitalize youth multicultural education for social integrity*. Seoul, South Korea: National Youth Policy Institute.

Yang, K-M. (2010). The influence of the school teachers` values on attitude toward the children from international marriage family. *Journal of School Psychology, 7(1),* 85-106.

Yang, O-S. (2002). Identity and professionality of early childhood teachers, where can we find them? *Educational Development, 133*, 26-33.

Yang, T-S. & Kyeong, S-H. (2011, September 26). Anti-multicultural trend, a time bomb of social conflict. *Yonhap News*. Retrieved from http://www.yonhapnews.co.kr/

Yeom, W-O. (2009). The Body of Others: Modernity and racism. *History and Culture, 17*, 134-155.

Yoo, S-A. (2011). Elementary school teachers` perceptions on multicultural education revealed through metaphor analysis. *Elementary Education, 24(3),* 117-145.

Yoon, H-S. (2004). The conflicts and adaptation of international marriage. In H. Choi, S-K. Kim, G-S. Jeong, & M-G. Yoo, *Minority in South Korea*. Seoul, South Korea: Han-ool

Yoon, K-J. & Kim, M-J. (2008). Development of cultural competency for preschool teacher in the multicultural era. *Journal of Future Early Childhood Education, 15(4),* 55-85.

Yoon, K-J. (2011). A study on the early childhood teachers` recognition, practices and needs of teacher education for multicultural education. *Journal of Early Childhood Education, 15(6),* 63-87.

Zeichner, K. (1996). Educating teachers for cultural diversity in the United States. In M. Craft (ed.), *Teacher education in plural societies: An international review* (pp.141-158). Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

Zembylas, M. (2003). Emotions and teacher identity: A postructural perspective. *Teaching and teacher Education, 9,* 213-238.

Zhu, Q-H. (2011). *Differences of multicultural experiences, attitudes, and efficacy between kindergarten teachers and elementary school teachers*. (Master thesis). Retrieved from RISS (Research Information Sharing Service). (Accession Order No.T12569431)

Zozakiewicz, C. &Rodriguez, A.J. (2007). Using sociotransformative constructivism to create multicultural and gender-inclusive classrooms: An intervention project for teacher professional development. *Educational Policy, 21(2).* 397-425.

Zumwalt, K. & Craig, E. (2008). Who is teaching? Does it matter? In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts (3rd ed.).* (pp. 404-423). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group/Association of Teacher Educators.

Vita

Seon-Young Kim earned her Bachelor of Science degree in elementary education from Korean National University of Education in Chung-Buk, South Korea in 2003. She taught as a public school teacher at Dongdo Elementary School in Daegu, South Korea for four years. In 2007, she was selected for graduate program and received full funding from Daegu Office of Education. In 2009, she received her Master of Education in elementary education from Korean National University of Education in Chung-Buk, South Korea. Between spring 2011 and fall 2014, she was a doctoral student in Curriculum Studies, Curriculum and Instruction at The University of Texas at Austin. She currently resides in Sunnyvale, California.

Permanent email address: path@hanmail.net

This dissertation was typed by Seon-Young Kim.